DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 299 892 HE 021 823

AUTHOR Norris, Donald M.; Poulton, Nick L.
TITLE A Guide for New Planners, 1987 Edition.
INSTITUTION Society for Coll. and Univ. Planning, Ann Arbor, Mich.
PUB DATE 87
NOTE 71p.
AVAILABLE FROM Society for College and University Planning, 2026M School of Education Building, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1259.
PUB TYPE Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Principles; Administrator Guides; Budgeting; Campus Planning; *College Planning; Competition; *Decision Making; *Entry Workers; Evaluation Criteria; Evaluation Methods; Futures (of Society); Higher Education; Information Sources; Long Range Planning; Organizational Climate; Professional Associations; Program Evaluation; Resource Allocation; Retrenchment
IDENTIFIERS *Enrollment Management; *Strategic Planning

ABSTRACT

Presented is a comprehensive guide to college planning principles and strategies designed for administrators new to the instructional planning function. An introductory section encourages new planners to understand the characteristics of planning and successful planners, understand different types of planning, appreciate the importance of all of the components of planning, and avoid reflexive planning behavior. The second chapter addresses issues in analysis and initial action, including the need to think about planning and the planning environment, understanding the administrative mandate and the organization's challenges, knowing the history of and resistance to planning and decisionmaking, launching new activities, and subsequent types of analysis. The third chapter discusses the literature of planning and planning research. Chapter four is a bibliography of planning, with these subheadings: the nature and history of planning, planning context, critique of planning, strategic planning and management, new directions and techniques, tactical planning, decision support for planning, and sources of information and professional organizations. Contains approximately 250 references. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED299892

GUIDE FOR NEW PLANNERS

1987 EDITION

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

SCUP

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

by
Donald M. Norris
and
Nick L. Poulton

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

HE 021 823

The Society for College SCUP and University Planning

A GUIDE FOR NEW PLANNERS

1987 EDITION

Published by
The Society for College and University Planning
2026M School of Education Building
The University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109-1259

Copyright © 1987 by The Society for College and University Planning
2026M School of Education Building
Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1259
(313) 763-4776
All rights are reserved.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Donald M. Norris is vice president and director of Washington operations for the M&H Group, Inc., a higher education management consulting firm specializing in strategic planning; mission, role, and scope studies; economic and technology development; assessing the educational needs of industry; planning for the partnerships between higher education and industry; enrollment management; program planning and development; organization planning; performance evaluation and development; institutional research and policy analysis; and information resources management. Prior to joining the M&H Group, he was director of policy and management services at Advanced Technology, Inc., a Washington-area consulting firm. Dr. Norris served as a planner and institutional researcher in institutions of higher education for over ten years, as director of planning and policy analysis at the University of Houston-University Park and in a variety of administrative posts at the University of Texas at Austin, the University of Michigan, and Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. He holds a B.S. in Engineering Mechanics, an M.B.A. from Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, and a Ph.D. from the Center for the Study of Higher Education at the University of Michigan.

Nick L. Poulton is a senior consultant with the M&H Group and has served with a variety of consulting firms in the Washington area specializing in information resource management and strategic planning in federal government agencies. Prior to that, he was director of planning and development at the University of the South Pacific, where he was responsible for planning and negotiating resources from over twenty government and international agencies. Dr. Poulton's twenty years experience in higher education also includes university planning at Western Michigan University, academic planning and analysis at the University of Michigan, and engineering technology education at Purdue University, both in the United States and in Afghanistan with a U.S.- funded engineering program. He holds a B.S. and M.S. in Electrical Engineering from Purdue University and a Ph.D. from the Center for the Study of Higher Education at the University of Michigan.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Any work such as this owes a special debt to the many authors in the field of planning whose works are summarized and annotated in the *Guide for New Planners*. This monograph benefited from helpful comments from Marvin Peterson, David Dill, R. Sue Mims, Frank Schmidtlein and Edward Delaney, to whom we express our appreciation. Recommendations on short lists of key current references in the tactical planning areas were provided by Frank Schmidtlein, Larry Leslie, Robert Barak, Bernie Sheehan, Ray Zammuto, and Kim Cameron, based on their work for Marvin Peterson's upcoming book, *Key Resources on Higher Education Governance, Management, and Leadership*; O. Robert Simha provided some useful citations and ideas in the area of facilities planning. We appreciate their willingness to share their findings with the members of the Society. Our colleagues at the M&H Group, Jana Matthews and Chuck Halbower, also critiqued and polished earlier versions, thereby contributing to the final product.

Finally, it is a pleasure to acknowledge the membership of the Society for College and University Planning, who, by requesting an up-to-date guide for planners, have made this revised edition possible. The authors wish to express special thanks to the Board of the Society for College and University Planning for their support in commissioning this document and to Joanne MacRae and Connie Taylor for their assistance and suggestions.

A TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 INTRODUCTION TO PLANNING 1

1.1 So You Have Been Asked to Plan? 1
1.2 Understand the Characteristics of Planning and of Successful Planners 4
1.3 Understand the Different Types of Planning 6
1.4 Appreciate the Importance of All Components of Planning 9
1.5 Avoid the Deadly Sins of Reflexive Planning Behavior 10

2.0 MOVING FORWARD: ANALYZE, ACT, AND ANALYZE SOME MORE 15

2.1 Think About Planning 15
2.2 Think About Your Planning Environment 16
Understand Your Charge/Mandate and Your Organization's Challenges
History of Decision Making and Planning/ Resistance to Planning
Potentials and Limitations of Planning
2.3 Move into Action: Launching Initial Activities 21
2.4 Analyze Some More 22
Tactics for Implementation
Consolidated Organizational Analysis
2.5 Conclusions on Your Chances for Success 24

3.0 A ROADMAP OF THE LITERATURE OF PLANNING 27

3.1 The Evolution of Planning in Higher Education 28
3.2 How Literature and Research Have Kept Pace with the Field 32
3.3 A Short List of References 34

4.0 BIBLIOGRAPHY OF PLANNING 41

4.1 Nature and History of Planning 41
4.2 Planning Context 42
4.3 Critique of Planning 44
4.4 Strategic Planning/Strategic Management 45
4.5 New Directions in Planning 47
Futures Techniques
Competitive Advantage
New External Relationships
Effectiveness, Quality and Outcomes

4.6 Tactical Planning 50
Budgeting and Resource Allocation
Retrenchment and the Management of Decline
Program Evaluation and Techniques of Evaluation
Academic Planning
Enrollment Planning and Management
Campus and Facilities Planning
4.7 Decision Support for Planning 58
4.8 Sources of Information and Professional Organizations 61
5.0 KEEP MOVING FORWARD AND LOOKING BACK 63

1.0 INTRODUCTION TO PLANNING

1.1 SO YOU HAVE BEEN ASKED TO PLAN?

Most college and university planners remember well the circumstances that led them to become associated with their institution's planning activities. While the chain of events varies from setting to setting, generally the episode went something like one of these:

- ★ You have just been hired as director of planning at a regional state university reporting directly to the president. By creating this new position, your president has made a commitment to planning and also has expressed a feeling that serious planning has not yet occurred at the institution. On arriving, you find you have no real job description and no real directions other than "to plan."

- ★ As vice president for administration, you have been asked by the president to recommend a process of dealing with the potential implications of your newest telecommunication proposal for the academic, administrative, financial, and physical facilities components of the campus. Your proposal deals solely with the technical aspects of several alternatives for wiring the campus, and you are uncertain of how to proceed.

- ★ While there is an existing planning process at your college, your president has charged you with injecting that process with a strategic planning flavor. Environmental scanning and issues management have been mentioned as possible methodologies, but the president has given no further guidance on how to incorporate them into the existing fabric of planning, saying "You're the executive assistant to the president. You tell me!"

- ★ As vice president for academic affairs at a small liberal arts college, you are concerned about the program mix at your institution and

your ability to deal with the increasingly technical and vocational interests of students. After receiving considerable pressure from the board to make the college's program more relevant, your president has asked you to develop an action plan specifying potential changes in your academic program.

★ As director of facilities planning at a major research university, you have just received a copy of a memo from the vice chancellor for academic affairs, complaining that planning for the new Natural Sciences Building has failed to recognize many of the needs of other disciplines and the long-term academic goals of the campus. You had utilized a planning committee in support of this project, but it was not connected with university-wide planning activities. You have now been instructed to propose changes in the structure of the planning process to ensure that this problem does not happen again.

★ In your newly appointed role as director of institutional research, you are expected to provide analytical support for the planning process, which is scheduled to begin its new cycle next month. The type of data provided in the last cycle was generally regarded as being too detailed and poorly structured, but you have not specifically been asked to revise the format.

★ Based on an idea picked up at a professional conference, the president of your community college has directed you, in your capacity as director of admissions and records, to form an "enrollment management council" not only to orchestrate recruiting and retention efforts and enrollment services, but also to deal with the challenges posed by increasing numbers of minority and older students. In the past, these functions have been performed by different committees reporting to different vice presidents. You are to have the committee in place and functioning within a month.

★ Your state's coordinating board has just launched a comprehensive, blue ribbon task force for a review of quality in higher education, and you have been designated as the official representative from your university to the faculty advisory committee supporting the task force. Your first meeting is next week, and you have been asked to submit to your president a strategy for dealing with the situation.

The common thread linking each of the situations above is that someone or some group has been asked to plan or to play a role in support of a planning process. Or perhaps someone has come to understand that planning is important and is searching for a way to advance the cause of planning at their institution. Or perhaps a college reaccreditation team, a college executive committee, the leadership of a development/capital campaign, or

some other group is attempting to use planning to fulfill its charge. The institutional settings are different, as are the nature of the problems and the characteristics of the actors or groups. But in each case, some individuals or group have been called upon to design and implement planning, generally with insufficient or even poor guidance, and under less than optimum conditions. The purpose of this monograph is to help the planner to plan under such circumstances. Chances are, you are beginning to plan in a similar situation.

But you are not alone. Planning seldom begins under textbook conditions; it almost never proceeds with perfect precision. Sometimes the planner receiving no guidance at all is more fortunate than the planner receiving guidance that is poorly conceived or misdirected. The purpose of this monograph is to help the new planner learn from the experiences of other planners about how to launch – and how not to launch – successful planning processes.

This is not a cookbook on how to plan by the numbers. So-called "prescriptive planning models" – those that assume perfectly rational decision making and pay inadequate attention to uncertainty and differences in environments – suggest ironclad steps and conditions for planning, but our approach does not. Rather, this is a *roadmap* of the field of planning that will help the planner to survey the situation and to develop a strategy for planning. Good planning is more like an art than a science in that it depends on sage assessment and careful implementation based on the uniquenesses of particular situations. Our roadmap suggests factors one should consider and where one can go in the literature to find assistance in formulating questions and developing answers.

Another way to make this point is to use Harold Enarson's metaphor, which distinguishes between the "Cook's Tour" approach to planning and the "Lewis and Clark" model. The Cook's Tour defines a precise schedule on a well-defined route; it moves in orderly progression past known landmarks. Its aim is to avoid contingencies and the unknown and to structure planning in a scheduled, ordered, and routine manner. On the other hand, the Lewis and Clark model incorporates a sense of adventure in the exploration of new planning frontiers. Lewis and Clark had a clear sense of context, direction, and what to look for, but their actual course was unknown. The Cook's Tour model gives the false impression of stability, while the Lewis and Clark model suggests values and principles that can help the planner to deal with the uncertainty and unpredictability of planning. Clearly, the Lewis and Clark model is the goal for higher education planning.

This monograph begins by describing certain characteristics and components of planning that the planner must understand and by recommending actions that the new planner should avoid until he/she has analyzed the situation and determined what initiatives are appropriate. It then suggests a framework that the planner should utilize in analyzing the new planning environment, the potentials of his role, the particular institutional needs, and the type of planning activities which are appropriate. It also provides an analysis of how planning has changed over the years and how the planner must reinterpret the literature and theory of planning based on emerging

issues, new challenges, and new techniques; this is critical to using the reference bibliography on the field of planning that is provided. This guide also suggests the several references and critical resources in each of several topical areas that are critical to developing understanding and to broadening competence for the new planner.

1.2 UNDERSTAND THE CHARACTERISTICS OF PLANNING AND OF SUCCESSFUL PLANNERS

However you come to decide that planning is necessary, either by directive, by appointment to a planning committee, or by responding to a problem that needs solving, you must understand some basic characteristics of planning. Moreover, you should also know what separates successful planners from those who labor with one planning process and then move on to other fields of endeavor.

Characteristics of Planning

Several attributes are common to all planning activities. First, planning should occur at all levels of the organization. Planning behavior is a basic responsibility of all managers, administrators, and academic leaders, and whether or not one is called a planner, planning is necessary to deal with the challenges of operation. In addition, planning can range in complexity and scope from simple problem solving activities to complex strategic planning or to comprehensive, long-range planning. Even if you are the only administrator with planning in your title, you are certainly not the only planner at your institution. Indeed, many so-called university planners are truly support staff to planning processes, while the true planners are faculty and administrators with "line" responsibilities.

Second, even if you are the first person in your organization officially to be designated with planning in your title, you are certainly not the first planner in your organization. Nor will you be the last. You must be aware of the strengths, weaknesses, and perceptions of previous planning activities, both formal and informal. You must devise a strategy for dealing with this residue in constructing your current and future planning activities. Moreover, you should remember that what you are doing will provide the basis for the planning activities of whoever succeeds you. No matter how good your planning procedures are, they will be changed, and probably with good reason. Neither plans nor planning processes are carved in stone.

Third, regardless of your level and responsibility for planning, an important task for you is to encourage "planning-oriented behavior" both in your domain and in those with whom you associate. Planning-oriented behavior is a way of functioning and viewing the world that believes in the value of planning. It supports analytic approaches – not exclusively quantitative in nature – and aims at influencing and making decisions in the real world, not in a dream world of perfectly rational, apolitical decisions. By fostering

planning oriented behavior, you will support the growth of planning in your organization.

Fourth, planning must pay attention to the timeframes, cycles, and sequences of institutional life. If not carefully related, the timeframes of planning and institutional decision making can become hopelessly disjointed. The budget cycle operates as a common linking element for budgetary and financial planning at different levels, but somehow planning involving academic, financial, physical, and human resource components must be linked and integrated carefully if effective planning is to occur.

Characteristics of Successful Planners

This *Guide for New Planners* makes several critical assumptions about the characteristics of successful planners. First, successful planners are students of planning theory and practice; they study and understand the basic theories of planning and new developments in the field. Second, successful planners are practical and are insightful interpreters of their organization and its needs. They apply planning theory and techniques with a keen eye to the needs of their organization and with a sensitivity to the importance of political and organizational considerations in planning. They integrate thought and action exceptionally well and conduct both simultaneously. Third, successful planners are continually evaluating, assessing, and rethinking their planning efforts. Fourth, successful planners recognize the need to "plan for planning" and to assure the continued vitality of planning in their organization. Fifth, successful planners realize that the "proof of planning is in the implementation," and they emphasize the importance of sound and effective implementation techniques. This *Guide for New Planners* is structured to provide the tools necessary for both new and experienced planners to attain these characteristics and to maximize their success.

Relationship of Planning to Other Organizational Functions

It is critical for the successful planner to understand the relationship of planning to other management functions of the organization. Planning is but one of the institution's basic management functions, along with academic program development and management, resource allocation, fundraising, evaluation of academic and administrative programs, enrollment management, and others. These managerial functions are part of the ongoing responsibilities of line managers, who often are assisted by special support staffs for these functions. Planning is often an instrument through which leadership confronts or deals with these other managerial functions, but planning is not "superior" to the other organizational functions. The successful planner must understand the relationship between these functions and craft planning activities to enhance the effectiveness of these other managerial activities.

1.3 UNDERSTAND THE DIFFERENT TYPES OF PLANNING

It is important to understand the definitions, characteristics, and strengths of different types of planning. For example, *strategic planning* is the activity through which one confronts the major strategic decisions facing the organization. A decision is not rendered "strategic" merely by being important. By Robert Shirley's definition, strategic decisions or issues fulfill the following criteria:

- Define the institution's relationship to its environment
- Generally take the whole organization as the unit of analysis
- Depend on inputs from a variety of functional areas
- Provide direction for, and constraints on, administrative and operational activities throughout the institution

Strategic planning is performed on an irregular timeframe as strategic challenges emerge. Strategic planning has grown in popularity in higher education as educational leaders adopt a more proactive, external orientation.

Some planners make the distinction between strategic planning and other types of planning: long-range, tactical, and operational. A common characteristic of these types of "organizational" planning is that their timeframes and cadences are defined by the needs of the organization, not by a changing environment. *Long-range planning* is a more routine and regular type of planning that operates within the guidelines set by strategic planning, on a five-to-ten-year year horizon. On the other hand, *tactical planning* consists of the short-term or intermediate-term, regular planning and budgeting activities dealing with administrative and operational activities that unfold within the overall strategic context of objectives established by strategic planning. *Operational planning* deals with short-term activities, generally on a one-year timeframe, that translate tactical plans into annual implementation.

In some applications, operational planning is called problem-focused, contingency, or performance improvement planning. *Problem focused or contingency planning* is generally short term and highly focused, dealing with problems that exist today. The solutions to these problems may be achievable in the long term, but the activities are highly targeted to deal with current problems. The use of the term *performance improvement planning* alludes to the use of operational planning to tune and improve the performance of current operations through annual adjustment. While each of these terms characterizes operational planning with a slightly different nuance of meaning, each is consistent in viewing operational planning as a practical, immediate, short-term activity having concrete results.

Robert Shirley has devised an especially helpful typology for dealing with strategic planning in the college or university. His "four levels of strategy" recognize that strategy is dealt with not only at the institutional level, but by colleges, departments, and other subunits. *Level 1: Institutional Strategy* deals with matching environmental opportunities with internal

strengths to determine basic mission, clientele, goals, program/service mix, geographic service area, and comparative advantage. *Level 2: Campus-wide Functional Strategies* deal with plans for finances, enrollment, admissions and recruitment, human resources, organization, and facilities to achieve the strategies outlined in the first level. *Level 3: Program Strategies* are plans by academic units in response to Levels 1 and 2, setting strategic profiles, action priorities, and resource requirements. *Level 4: Program-level Function Strategies* are the plans for admissions, curriculum, staffing, recruitment, and budget to achieve the program strategies established in Level 3. This typology shows how strategy at the institutional level gets translated into strategy and into tactical and operational plans at the program level.

None of these typologies of planning is intrinsically superior to the other. In any setting, all types of planning must occur, but in different measure, depending on the nature of the environmental challenges facing the organization, the nature of the organization, and a variety of situational factors. While strategic planning is enjoying growing popularity in higher education, it has not eclipsed the more traditional focus of long-range, tactical, and operational planning, which must still continue in the organization.

Consequently, one of the critical understandings for today's planner is how to link strategic planning activities with the more traditional, organizational planning activities. Exhibit 1 illustrates the differences between strategic and organizational planning and suggests means to link strategic and organizational planning. Strategic planning is externally directed, focuses on "what" the organization should do, deals with "macro" issues, spans organizational boundaries, is a continuing process dictated by changes in the environment that occur on an irregular timeframe, deals with relatively greater levels of uncertainty, and values expert judgment. Organizational planning is internally focused, emphasizes "how" to do the "what" stipulated by strategic planning, deals with the impact of "macro" issues on "micro" issues, is tied to organizational units and the budget/resource allocations process, is relatively certain – or at least depends on the appearance of certainty – and is highly participatory and constituency based. It is often necessary to craft an entirely different planning process and structure to deal with strategic planning, but to link it with the existing processes and structures for organizational planning.

One of the most tantalizing features of Exhibit 1 is the arrows linking strategic planning with organizational planning. A whole monograph could be written on how to make these linkages work in different settings. There is no single tool or methodology; however, combinations of the following items offer several possibilities:

- Environmental scanning to search out the emerging issues and challenges that requires changes in strategy
- Issues management to translate those "macro" changes into impacts on "micro" components of tactical and operational planning
- Willingness to modify and tinker with established plans as new strategies emerge

EXHIBIT 1
LINKING STRATEGIC PLANNING AND OTHER TYPES OF ORGANIZATIONAL PLANNING



CHARACTERISTICS:

STRATEGIC	ORGANIZATIONAL
• EXTERNAL FOCUS	• INTERNAL FOCUS
• WHAT TO DO	• HOW TO DO IT
• MACRO ISSUES	• IMPACT OF MACRO ISSUES ON MICRO ISSUES
• BOUNDARY SPANNING	• TIED TO ORGANIZATIONAL UNITS
• CONTINUAL SCANNING PROCESS TO NOTICE CHANGES OCCURING IRREGULARLY, DICTATED BY ENVIRONMENT	• REGULAR PROCESSES DICTATED BY ORGANIZATIONAL CYCLES
	• LINKED TO BUDGET/RESOURCE ALLOCATION PROCESS
• EXPERT PARTICIPATION	• CONSTITUENT PARTICIPATION

These are all components of successful linkages between strategic thinking and organizational planning

Numerous authors have created a variety of typologies that characterize planning in different ways. The important point is that the planner understands how the types of planning vary and can apply a framework for differentiating between types of planning that are sensible for his setting and are easily communicated. The planner must be able to convey this sense of the differences in planning, and all information relating to the process and products of planning, in jargon-free, simple, expository English.

1.4 APPRECIATE THE IMPORTANCE OF ALL COMPONENTS OF PLANNING

It is also important to evaluate your role and the planning needs of your organization in the context of the different components of planning:

- Planning structure
- Planning process
- Information and analytic support of planning

Every planning activity is composed of some combination of these three components, and it is critical that you achieve a balance among the three that is congruent with the purposes of planning and the needs of your environment.

Most planners have strong feelings about *planning structure*, the infrastructure of planning committees and support staff, and *planning process*, the actual flow and substance of the planning activities. But several generalizations are in order. First, all organizations must achieve in their planning structure and process some balance between "top-down" and "bottom-up" planning. In educational organizations the balance often swings toward a participatory, "bottom-up" approach, but the new planner needs to seek a balance appropriate to the given setting. Often the key is to identify those components of planning that need not be participatory and can be centrally directed, while subtly but firmly providing top-down direction and articulation to those areas where participation and consensus are critical, thus adhering to the spirit of the academic ethic of bottom-up planning and faculty participation. Second, and as previously stated, structures and processes must change and evolve, and one is well served by building that consideration into one's structure and process from the start.

Of the three components of planning, planning structure and planning process are the most highly situational and the components about which the fewest helpful generalizations can be drawn. The successful tailoring of a planning process and structure to a particular setting – probably more art than science – must be based on careful, structured, insightful analysis of the organizational setting, both past and present, and the potentials and limitation of planning. It is also dependent on careful and skillful implementation through which process and structure can be further tuned and modi-

fied, based on changing conditions or greater insight. Planning structure and process must be integrated with the decision making process so that planning can inform and shape decisions, not provide support or contradiction for decisions already made. The planning process and structure must continually be tuned to remain integrated with the changing decision making patterns.

Information and analytic support are often the stepchild of the planning process, an afterthought used to provide piles of data for planning committees to "chew on" while the planning process unfolds. Properly designed, however, a program of analytic support can provide key environmental intelligence, can manage and identify the issues confronting the organization, and can move the process along by focusing attention and forcing decisions at appropriate junctures. Analytic support can be provided by a variety of parties and should consist of both qualitative and quantitative components, tailored to the types of planning being undertaken.

Since the increase in popularity of strategic planning, even greater attention has been paid to analytic support of planning. Strategic planning utilizes substantially different types of information than does organizational planning. Exhibit 2 compares and contrasts these differences. Strategic planning typically deals with external data, environmental scanning, issues management, and scenario-casting activities that are far more adventuresome; deals with greater uncertainty; examines institutional values; and ventures farther afield than does organizational planning. But at some point, even these ventures in speculation must be tied to decisions and strategies that link to the present and to the existing organizations. One of the key roles of planning staff is to support both strategic and organizational planning and to assist in the necessary linking of the two.

1.5 AVOID THE DEADLY SINS OF REFLEXIVE PLANNING BEHAVIOR

In addition to conceptual and theoretical knowledge about planning, the successful planner must go forth armed with the practical knowledge about how to make planning work. As a complement to knowing what one should do to embark on planning, it is equally important to know what not to do. New planners, or presidents that appoint new planners, often respond by reflex to the beginning of a planning engagement. Avoid at all costs the following temptations, which are summarized in Exhibit 3:

1. *Do not attempt to implement, off the shelf, a planning process from another institution or from a textbook.* Prescriptive models for planning or processes that worked at other institutions and are outlined in "planning handbooks" are good places to turn for ideas, but they should not be applied without careful analysis and adaptation to your special needs and circumstances. Conditions that make an approach effective in one setting may not be present in your setting.

EXHIBIT 2
DIFFERENT INFORMATION FOR DIFFERENT TYPES OF PLANNING AND DECISION MAKING

	STRATEGIC	LONG TERM/TACTICAL/OPERATIONAL
ORIENTATION	• EXTERNAL	• INTERNAL
NATURE OF INFORMATION	• UNCERTAIN	• CERTAIN
	• WIDE RANGING	• ESTABLISHED
	• SPECIFIED BY ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS	• SPECIFIED BY ORGANIZATIONAL CYCLES
	• QUALITATIVE, VALUE-LADEN, AND POLITICAL	• RATIONAL AND QUANTITATIVE
INFORMATION SYSTEM FOCUS	• INTELLIGENCE	• RATIONAL AND QUANTITATIVE
	• VALUES	
	• ALTERNATIVES	
DECISION SUPPORT	• DECISION SUPPORT SYSTEMS FOR SEMI-STRUCTURED OR UNDERSTRUCTURED DECISIONS	• MIS TO SUPPORT STRUCTURED AND SEMISTRUCTURED DECISIONS

2. *Do not assume that all planning activities must be comprehensive, institution wide, and time consuming.* Successful, impactful planning can be highly targeted and problem focused. In some cases, a succession of plans dealing with different units is more effective than a single, grand plan. Planning does not need to be part of a formally constituted planning process, although it should dovetail with the formal planning process, if one exists. It can be as simple or complex, and as abrupt or time-consuming, as needs demand. Even robust, all-encompassing planning processes begin modestly. In time, one can move toward comprehensiveness, if conditions warrant, building on success.

3. *Do not spend six months reading and thinking before you do anything.* It is often better to take half the time to do something eighty percent as well than to strive for perfection. Just as it is wrong to attempt to apply another institution's process off the shelf, it is equally wrong to attempt to study the problem to death. Precious

EXHIBIT 3
AVOID THE DEADLY SINS OF REFLEXIVE PLANNING

- DO NOT ATTEMPT TO IMPLEMENT, OFF THE SHELF, THE PLANNING PROCESS THAT WORKED SO WELL AT ANOTHER INSTITUTION WITH WHICH YOU ARE FAMILIAR
- DO NOT ASSUME THAT ALL PLANNING ACTIVITIES MUST BE COMPREHENSIVE, INSTITUTION WIDE, AND TIME CONSUMING
- DO NOT SPEND SIX MONTHS READING BEFORE YOU DO ANYTHING
- DO NOT FORM A PLANNING COMMITTEE AS YOUR FIRST ACT
- DO NOT DWELL ON INFORMATION NEEDS THAT WILL TAKE A YEAR TO COMPLETE OR FULFILL BEFORE YOU CAN MOVE THE PROCESS FORWARD, AND DO NOT USE DATA AS A "SECURITY BLANKET"
- DO NOT LABEL WHAT YOU DOING AS SOMETHING NEW, REVOLUTIONARY, AND WONDERFUL
- DO NOT CHARACTERIZE PLANNING AS BEING ABLE TO SOLVE ALL OF YOUR PROBLEMS
- DO NOT OVEREMPHASIZE THE IMPORTANCE OF A FINAL PLAN
- DO NOT CLAIM THAT PLANNING CAN ADDRESS ALL ISSUES AT ONCE
- BE CAREFUL ABOUT PROCLAIMING THAT YOUR PLANNING PROCESS IS THE FIRST STEP IN AN ON-GOING PLANNING PROCESS
- DO NOT ASSUME THAT LONG TERM PLANS ARE STRATEGIC OR THAT ANY IMPORANT ISSUE IS "STRATEGIC"
- DO NOT ASSUME THAT PLANNING ADDRESSES ONLY PROBLEM SOLVING NEEDS
- DO NOT ENCOURAGE OTHERS TO THINK OF YOU AS "THE INSTITUTIONAL PLANNER"

opportunities will be missed, and a failure to generate planning products on a timely basis will erode what support planning has.

4. *Do not form a planning committee as your first act.* Many planning activities and processes at some point benefit from a formal planning committee, but the membership and charge of the committee must be carefully considered to meet the needs of your situation. Even worse than appointing the committee as your first action is inheriting a committee as part of your charge. It is best not to convene that committee before you have things for it to do or products to give it and before you have carefully structured the committee's role and limitations. Naming the committee may be your first *official* or *public* act, but it must come after deliberation.

5. *Do not identify information needs that will take a year to complete or fulfill before you can move the process forward and do not use data as a "security blanket."* Information that is targeted to drive decisions is fine. Data gathered in a "surveillance mode" may keep your analysis busy, but such data are not very useful. Build on information that is currently available; even if retooling will ultimately be necessary, do *not* redefine everything.

   Two corollaries to this point are "Do not wait until all the information is in to move the process forward" and "Do not identify and start to collect the information needed before you have considered the questions to be asked." These roles may seem like pure common sense, but they are often ignored until it is too late.

6. *Do not label what you are doing as something new, revolutionary, and wonderful.* If you do not believe in truth in advertising at the beginning of your planning process, you will by the end. A corollary to this point is "Do not assume that planning is the only thing or even the most important thing going on in the life of your institution." Planning is one of many instruments that are being utilized to deal with the ongoing management responsibilities and functions of your institution.

7. *Do not characterize planning as being able to solve all of the institution's problems.* This is a further corollary of point #6. Even if decisions made by virtue of planning solve some of your problems, planning may actually help you to identify problems of which you were not aware and for which there are no easy answers. While university faculty and administrators generally don't slay the bearers of bad tidings, no patient appreciates what will ultimately prove to be a good prescription while the taste of bad medicine is still lingering on the palate.

8. *Do not overemphasize the importance of a final plan.* In some cases, the process is as important as the plan, and the right decision resulting from the planning processes is more important than a library full of plans. Remember Eisenhower's dictum, "Plans are nothing, planning is everything." A plan may be necessary in your circumstances, but it may not be. Indeed, it is probably better to assume that a final plan of more than five pages is *not* necessary unless proven otherwise.

9. *Do not claim that a single planning process or effort can capture all issues.* In reality, planning that focuses on particular issues, placed in an appropriate context, is more successful than planning that tries to be all things to all issues. Planning processes need focal points and ways of separating the issues and devoting energies to the most important. Work with feasible, manageable tasks. Focus on a limited number of themes for each planning cycle.

10. *Be careful about proclaiming that your planning process is the first step (or second, or third, for that matter) in an ongoing planning process.* Don't get us wrong: continuity is critical and many planning processes suffer from lack of integration among successive planning efforts. For existing planning processes, it is important that current and future planning will build on the lessons from past planning. For new planning processes, it is critical to suggest that future efforts will improve and that perfection is far from possible, initially. However, it is also possible to generate "anticipatory fatigue" if too much is made of the ongoing burden of planning in perpetuity.

11. *Do not assume that long-term plans are strategic or that any important issue is strategic.* Many organizations conclude that if they have a long-term plan dealing with important issues, they have done strategic planning. That is not necessarily true. The importance and timeframe of issues does not make them strategic. Strategic issues are those that deal with the organization's relationship with the environment and affect most of the organization. Thus all strategic issues are important, but not all important issues are strategic.

12. *Do not assume that planning addresses only problem solving needs.* While it is true that to be successful, planning must deal with problems and be seen to provide at least some solutions, planning can deal with other needs as well. It can be a powerful instrument of organizational development and of political orchestration. It can be used to build or divorce constituencies and political alliances. Planning can also be used to introduce ideas, concepts, and managerial approaches to the organizational community. Under some circumstances, these other uses of planning can be even more important than its problem-solving thrust.

13. *Do not encourage others to think of you as "the institutional planner."* Particularly if you are a staff member, being labeled as *the* planner is a liability. The naive will think you are making critical decisions (which could not be more wrong and could be dangerous if true), and the responsible may avoid their obligation to think strategically. The critical role is to entice line administrators and appropriate faculty members to exercise their responsibility to think strategically and plan for their respective units.

Now that we have addressed some basic concepts of planning and have identified some seductive traps that the planner must avoid, it is time to address what the planner should do when confronted with the challenge of a new planning engagement.

2.0 MOVING FORWARD: ANALYZE, ACT, AND ANALYZE SOME MORE

While knowing what *not* to do can help planners avoid costly mistakes, there is no clear-cut, prescribed sequence of what to do to launch planning. Using common sense and some of the principles that follow, the new planner can tailor a combination of thinking and action that suits her circumstances. It is critical that the planner thinks about what she is doing and plans for planning by following a structured, action-oriented agenda.

2.1 THINK ABOUT PLANNING

One would not expect that college and university planners need to be told to think, but the lure of reflexive planning behavior is stronger than one might suspect. Even the experienced planner needs to refresh his thinking and discover new insights by reviewing recent work on planning. The new planner needs to draw more deeply on the literature, both old and new, to develop some basic understanding of the concepts and practices of planning. The purpose of the analysis of new trends in planning and of the bibliography on planning highlighted in this *Guide for New Planners* is to enable such research and analysis to be conducted expeditiously. While it is a grave error to research planning for six months before doing anything, it is an even more grievous error for an experienced planner not to review recent developments in the theory and practice of planning and not to organize his thoughts about planning before proceeding with his newest planning engagement. Just like in football, ballet, and public speaking, it never hurts in planning to revisit the basics.

While the literature on the theory and practice of planning is a good place to turn, the planner should also tap other sources such as visits to other institutions and candid discussions with others involved in planning. Gathering "fugitive" documents and samples of planning materials – along with honest assessments of how they were received – will yield not just a pre-

scriptive model that can be parroted, but also insights and ideas that can be reinterpreted in your own setting. Talking to administrators and faculty at your institution and others can generate some healthy input. Out of a comparative analysis of the experiences of others, filtered by an understanding of one's own institution, can come some helpful ideas and insights.

This analysis/research should enable the planner to develop a basic understanding of the following areas:

- Differences in the types of planning
- Variety in the components of planning
- New trends in planning
- Changing issues and challenges that drive planning

At the same time that you as a planner are researching and developing/redeveloping your understanding of these topics, you should be analyzing the planning environment in which you will be operating.

2.2 THINK ABOUT YOUR PLANNING ENVIRONMENT

There are several components of one's particular planning environment of which every planner should be aware:

- Your charge/mandate and your organization's challenges
- History of planning and resistance to planning
- Potentials for planning and limitations in planning

No matter how long you have been at your institution and no matter how many hours you have spent thinking about planning in the past, invest additional time before you begin each new planning engagement. Analyzing these institutional contextual factors can be time well spent.

Understand Your Charge/Mandate and Your Organization's Challenges

It is important to think before you act, but your analysis and reflections should not be focused so long as to delay timely action. Your first task should be to analyze the charge or mandate you have been given or that you have requested and determine whether it is definitive and/or binding. The limitations of a restrictive or poorly framed charge must be understood and to the extent possible, overcome. While most planners would prefer the luxury of collaborating with their president in drafting their charge, in real life they often must deal with a charge into which they had no input. The planner must also understand the nature of the challenges facing the organization, whether addressing all or any of these can be legitimately included in the charge, and how to confront these challenges through planning.

One of the key facts about planning is that it cannot be effective if it attempts to deal with too many issues at once. At any time, certain key

issues or "themes" emerge, based on the nature of challenges facing the organization, the history of planning, and future changes in the environment that should be dealt with in today's planning process. Often a strategic planning activity can be utilized to generate the themes that then serve as the context for the next round of organizational planning, or strategic planning can continue to generate new themes and issues as the organizational planning process proceeds along its prescribed path.

History of Decision Making and Planning/Resistance to Planning

In order to understand the potentials and limitations of planning, you must understand the history of decision making, planning, and governance at your institution or agency. In many cases, this analysis must extend to encompass a multi-institutional environment, either a system of institutions in which you operate, the public institutions in your state, or any other cluster of institutions of which you are a part. To understand the history of decision making and planning you must recognize the following:

- The style and context of your organization
- The relative power of external and internal forces shaping decision making
- The nature and successes of planning in the past
- Any biases and prejudices against planning and their relative strength
- Key supporters and detractors of planning and governance and their power to obstruct the process

Planning must be integrated in the ongoing decision making and governance processes, and the planner must be wary of planning charges that ignore or attempt to finesse that issue. Sometimes new planning processes are created because of deficiencies in the existing decision-making process; if they don't confront these problems directly, however, they are seen as dealing with symptoms rather than with the core problems themselves. Furthermore, decision making cannot be suspended until a planning cycle has been completed. Problems and opportunities must continue to be faced and addressed as they arrive.

Understanding the history of planning is fundamental to success. Almost every planning process, no matter how successful, has its negative aspects. The "unsavory residue" from previous planning interactions can impede or destroy subsequent planning activities. Some experienced observers of institutional life believe that a key determinant of the successful planner is being able to walk through a previous planner's unsavory residue without getting any on the carpet.

It is too easy for believers in planning to underestimate both the resistance to planning in any organization and the resistance to your particular planning initiative. Don't be misled. Planners are prime targets for resistance, opposition, and second guessing. First, not everyone operates with the

same notion of planning. For example, in most settings, academic affairs officers and financial officers can each make strong and cogent arguments that their brand of planning is best for the institution. Each will claim to include a place for strategic thinking, qualitative and quantitative judgments, academic values, and financial reality in his brand of planning. Each will truly believe that his variation is best for the organization, and depending on the circumstances, either may be right. Second, it is wrong to assume that resistance to planning is irrational or unjustified. Some institutional officers may feel they are better able to plan unfettered by the distractions of participatory planning processes, cumbersome review procedures, and protracted discussion. Others may consider strategic planning to be impractical crystal-ball gazing, and depending on the particular institutional history of planning and the issues at hand, they may be correct. Third, it is easy to underestimate the threat that planning poses in many traditional organizations. To the extent that it slices 'across hierarchical boundaries, planning can threaten existing power centers. It can also threaten to put planning staff and/or a planning committee between the president and the deans, vice president, and other officers. Defensive behavior to such a threat is neither irrational nor unwarranted.

It also is not always easy to determine what someone means when he says "yes" to planning. He may have a different vision of it than you do or may be jumping on the bandwagon to use your planning processes as a bully pulpit for showcasing his own pet issues and concerns, which may be antithetical to your own.

Many a planning process that is otherwise well defined to meet the challenges facing the organization has been doomed by a failure to understand the lessons of organizational history and the inherent resistance to planning. Tactics for dealing with resistance in a politic manner are essential. Exhibit 4 summarizes how to understand the history of planning and potential resistance to planning.

Potentials and Limitations of Planning

As planners, we all believe in the potentials of planning. To establish balance, one must consider the limitations to planning and the obstacles to overcome in attempting to implement planning in higher education. Exhibit 5 cites several key limitations and obstacles that are especially restrictive on the application of planning in colleges and universities.

1. *Organizational goals in higher education are often vague and diffuse and even when well defined, are often contested.* Planning theory, as applied to most organizational settings, assumes that goals are clearly articulated and widely agreed upon. In higher education, goals are often purposely left vague and open to varying interpretation. When they are clearly stated, goals in higher education are often contested and even resisted. While in many cases it serves the planner better to define goals, in other cases it can serve the organization's planning purposes to leave the goals open to interpretation, at least initially.

EXHIBIT 4
UNDERSTANDING AND RESPONDING TO INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING HISTORY AND POTENTIAL RESISTANCE

- ASSESS WITHOUT PREJUDICE ANY "UNSAVORY RESIDUE" REMAINING FROM PREVIOUS PLANNING PROCESSES
- UNDERSTAND THE THREAT THAT PLANNING POSES TO EXISTING INSTITUTIONAL POWER BASES
- IDENTIFY KEY SUPPORTERS AND DETRACTORS OF PLANNING AND THEIR POWER TO OBSTRUCT OR STRENGTHEN PLANNING
- BE CERTAIN THAT THE PRESIDENT SUPPORTS YOUR PLANNING EFFORT AND MAKES HIS SUPPORT KNOWN TO LEADERSHIP AND THE ORGANIZATION AT LARGE
- EMPHASIZE, BY WORD AND DEED, THAT PLANNING IS A LINE FUNCTION, AND PLANNING SUPPORT IS A STAFF FUNCTION
- WORK TO BUILD CONSENSUS AND SUPPORT
- DO NOT OVERSELL PLANNING AND KEEP AN APPROPRIATE PROFILE

2. *The division of responsibility is unclear for strategy setting between disciplinary units and the organization as a whole.* The strong disciplinary, decentralized nature of higher education makes strategy setting difficult for the organization as a whole. Individual units are scanning their own discipline's environment and are making informed micro judgments which may conflict with the macro judgments being made for the organization as a whole. On the other hand, individual units seldom consider adequately certain boundary-spanning issues and trends that may affect them in the future.
3. *Loose coupling of organizational units often precludes timely, organization-wide responsiveness and setting of strategy.* The disciplinary, decentralized orientation of colleges and universities is translated into strategy setting that is slower than one would consider optimal, due to the need for collaboration and verification. This must be recognized by the planner in establishing realistic timeframes and mechanisms for strategic response.
4. *Cultures and histories of universities often make them slow, if not hesitant, to change.* Colleges and universities have not survived for thousands of years by changing rapidly or dramatically – at least not often. Especially as regards basic values, colleges and universities are very stable. The faculty's orientation toward debate and review must be taken into account when assessing the potentials for change.

EXHIBIT 5
LIMITATIONS TO PLANNING AND OBSTACLES TO OVERCOME

- ORGANIZATIONAL GOALS IN HIGHER EDUCATION ARE OFTEN VAGUE AND DIFFUSE, AND WHEN WELL DEFINED, ARE OFTEN CONTESTED.
- THE DIVISION OF RESPONSIBILITY IS UNCLEAR FOR STRATEGY SETTING BETWEEN DISCIPLINARY UNITS AND THE ORGANIZATION AS A WHOLE.
- LOOSE COUPLING OF ORGANIZATIONAL UNITS OFTEN PRECLUDES TIMELY, ORGANIZATION-WIDE RESPONSIVENESS AND SETTING OF STRATEGY.
- CULTURES AND HISTORIES OF UNIVERSITIES OFTEN MAKE THEM HESITANT TO CHANGE.
- INSTITUTIONAL LEADERSHIP DOES NOT NECESSARILY CONTROL THE INSTITUTION'S DIRECTION.
- THERE IS SELDOM BASIC AGREEMENT ON STRATEGY; EVEN IF THE INSTITUTIONAL STRATEGY IS CLEAR AND WELL ARTICULATED, THE STRATEGY OF INDIVIDUAL UNITS MAY NOT BE CLEAR AND COMPATIBLE WITH IT.
- INSTITUTIONAL LEADERSHIP MAY BE POORLY PREPARED, BY TRAINING AND EXPERIENCE, TO SET STRATEGY.
- IT IS QUITE DIFFICULT TO LINK VALUE- AND IDEA-ORIENTED STRATEGIC PLANNING TO BUDGET-ORIENTED ORGANIZATIONAL PLANNING.

5. *Institutional leadership does not necessarily control the institution's direction.* In many cases institutional inertia or external forces are controlling organizational direction, and institutional leaders are managing or accommodating to those forces – in some cases because the external forces cannot be controlled or manipulated, but in many cases because of lack of leadership. To control the organization's direction, to the extent possible, leaders must lead.

6. *There is seldom basic agreement on strategy.* Just as there is disagreement in goals, there is wide variation of opinion in organizational strategy. Even among an apparently tightly knit leadership team, differences exist – and this is good.

7. *Even if institutional strategy is clear and well articulated, the strategy of individual units may not be clear and compatible with it.* This is a corollary to items #2 and #3. Indeed, there may be covert, but real, contradiction of organizational strategy in the intent and actions of individual units.

8. *Institutional leadership is probably poorly prepared, by training and experience, to set strategy.* Your organization's leadership is probably adequately schooled in organizational planning, but seriously deficient in setting strategy and performing strategic planning. The planner must recognize this and establish the education of leadership as a top priority, although it must be handled diplomatically and perhaps unobtrusively.

9. *It is difficult to link value-oriented and idea-oriented strategic planning to budget-oriented organizational planning.* One of the most common reasons for failures in strategic planning is the failure to link it adequately with organizational planning. The setting of "what to do" through strategy planning must be grounded in the reality of what levels of resources may be available. Value-oriented strategy must be translated into operational terms that work for organizational planning.

2.3 MOVE INTO ACTION: LAUNCHING INITIAL ACTIVITIES

Concurrent with the analysis of planning needs, it is important to launch carefully considered and highly targeted planning activities. Continue to read in the planning literature to build on your foundation of understanding about the basic role and structure of planning and about the particular aspects which seem congruent with the problems facing your organization. You should also develop an inventory of existing information sources, analytical capabilities, and planning tools. You must build upon this base, but not adhere slavishly to bad practices. Develop a sense of what kinds of information are needed to support your mix of planning activities and how much in existing information can be absorbed. At the same time, you can set in motion the process of fulfilling information requirements that are presently unfilled. But planning activities must move forward before all the information is completed.

Finally, possible participants in the planning process should be sought out, if they have not been already selected for you. The choice of participants should balance the need to represent certain constituencies with the need to choose persons who can be counted on to foster planning-oriented behavior. While differences of opinion are generally healthy in moderate measures, persons of constructive, action-oriented demeanor are preferable to professional curmudgeons, pedants, congenital contemplators, and other sorts of "unplanners" who are lurking about, seeking the opportunity to become part of your planning process. A handful of "unplanners" can scuttle an otherwise well-conceived planning process.

Do not be afraid to change the structure, process, and analytical support of planning. Indeed, build flexibility into your process. As you continue to analyze your circumstances, your perception of needs will change. "Adapt or die" is an apt observation for planning processes, and one should engender

both the expectations of change and the capability to change into one's planning activities. It is probably best to consider your structure/process/support design for planning as an "emergent design," providing enough structure and form to convince the planning publics that you know what you're doing, but maintaining enough flexibility to change process/structure/support to fit your emerging sense of what will succeed.

2.4 ANALYZE SOME MORE

Having analyzed the environment for prospects for planning and having launched a number of planning-related activities, the planner should then devise a mixture of conscious tactics for each component of planning: the planning process, the formal planning structure, and the information and analytic support. Recognizing the particular needs and challenges of the situation, no two approaches to planning should be precisely alike. Take as an example an engineering department using planning to focus on its need to acquire, with creative financing, a range of equipment to support a new research lab. It may utilize an information heavy, highly analytic approach performed by one or two key faculty or administrators, in a relatively informal process. On the other hand, a university performing a strategic assessment of its market potential may constitute a formal, participatory planning process which is richly supported by quantitative and qualitative information on the external environment.

Remember that many planning engagements can fail due to lack of adequate staff support. Information and analytic support can require significant staff resources – even for a process in which the information requirements are kept under control – and can become a tremendous resource sink for processes in which the information requested buries the participants in a blizzard of numbers and paper. In addition, managing and scheduling a planning process and structure can consume significant staff time. Often, a planning committee or planning process is constituted with inadequate thoughts being given to these matters. Don't fall into this same trap.

Tactics for Implementation

A critical component of institutional planning is an awareness of the importance of implementation. One must set in motion planning activities and behaviors that will produce usable results quickly and in a manner likely to win support for the planning process. Even planning activities that are fundamentally long term in thrust and will not fully address the major problems at hand for some time should be devised in such a manner as to produce usable and useful results quickly. A number of examples reinforce this point:

- *Problem-focused planning that addresses particular institutional problems.* Even planning that is long range and/or strategic in

nature could be used to address current problems. Such solutions build the credibility of the process.

- *External environmental scanning that yields important information about the institution's external environment.* This sort of product is useful to the institution even before the planning process is completed. In addition to being useful, it shows how planning is different from normal managerial activity that is internally and historically focused.
- *Useful collections and syntheses of information in a form not available from large-scale data bases.* It is critical that planning be supported by useful collections of information and combinations of information, with the emphasis on information that is distilled down to a useful level, not hopelessly expanded.
- *A planning process in which the bringing together of different parties is in itself beneficial.* In many cases, the process of planning can be more important than the plan or any of the planning products. The process can be a means of dealing with other issues and of resolving misunderstandings.

Remember: New or rejuvenated planning processes have a honeymoon period, during which one needs to launch activities with a good grounding in planning concepts and insightful organizational analysis; produce some immediate dividends that will win and/or sustain supporters and weaken detractors; and chart one's planning on a course that will provide intermediate-term and long-term dividends to the organization. Time is limited, and one must use it wisely. The planner must also recognize that he must actively but subtly build support for planning – otherwise support may erode long before the planning cycle is complete.

An important aspect of a strategy for planning is to understand where the planning process is headed and what the product will be – and will not be. On the information front, the planning strategy should early on consider the combinations and distillations of information that will be reflected in the final plan or used as a basis for action. The nature of the decisions that will be supported should be understood. Your conception of the outcome of planning will probably change dramatically as the process proceeds.

A thought on the nature of plans: While there is a need for lengthy, detailed organizational plans for some purposes, most strategic plans should be short, highly focused, and lucid. Plans must communicate and even persuade. Your schedule should provide time and resources for generating executive summaries of organizational plans and five-page strategic plans that will be widely read and exercise influence.

Besides winning support for planning by creating usable products early on, tactics for implementation should continually strive to disarm critics and cultivate supporters in a variety of ways. It is a truism that planning cannot succeed without the blessing of the chief executive officer, and that blessing must be extended to include vice presidents and other key actors.

The planner must continually manage the process to win new supporters and sustain those supporters already in the planning camp.

Planners must unashamedly plan for their own survival. Support for planning often ebbs and flows in organizations, and planners can survive best if they have other "lilypads" on which they can perch when planning is dormant or have other organizational and operational functions which they can perform when planning is not in vogue. Many planners have effectively utilized such quiet times as opportunities to develop analytic capabilities, to identify and prepare for new external challenges, and to tool up in preparation for the next round of active interest in planning. View these inevitable slow periods as opportunities and use them wisely.

Consolidated Organizational Analysis

In summary, the analysis of planning and launching of new planning activities should cover the topics summarized in Exhibit 6. Not every one of these topics and questions is equally important in every organizational setting, and some can be ignored. There is no best format for arraying the results of your organizational analysis. It should be in a form that makes sense to you and which can be communicated by you to others such as your president, whom you may need to persuade. The important point is to think these topics through carefully and to structure the results so that you can comprehend the interrelationships between the characteristics of your planning environment. Moreover, you need to revisit your analysis over time as conditions and your level of insight change.

2.5 CONCLUSIONS ON YOUR CHANCES FOR SUCCESS

To the new planner enticed into a planning venture by the honeyed words of a persuasive president, or by the challenge of addressing serious issues facing the organization, much of our message may seem discouraging. Planning is serious business, challenged at every turn by existing power groups, unabashed detractors, and difficult, intractable issues; requiring theoretical understanding, the integration of theory and practice, insightful organizational analysis, and political acumen; and depending for success on hard work, the support of the president, and no small measure of luck.

The good news is that you don't need to be perfect or superhuman to be a successful planner. Most successful planners have at one time or another made most of the mistakes which we have described, but they have learned from their errors. What is deadly is to misunderstand profoundly the basic nature of planning and of your organization's challenges and to trap yourself in an inflexible planning structure that does not enable adaptation. If you understand how to play the planning game, you can be successful and your organization can reap the benefits of healthy planning activities.

EXHIBIT 6
CHECKLIST FOR ANALYZING PLANNING ENVIRONMENT AND FOR LAUNCHING OR MODIFYING PLANNING ACTIVITIES

I. HISTORY OF PLANNING IN YOUR SETTING

- CHRONOLOGY OF MAJOR PLANNING ACTIVITIES
- CHARACTERISTICS OF MAJOR PLANNING ACTIVITIES
  - -- Style and Content
  - -- Planning Process/Planning Structure/Analytic Support
  - -- Major Issues Addressed
  - -- Successes/Failures
  - -- Supporters/Detractors

II. DESCRIPTION OF CURRENT PLANNING ACTIVITIES

- WHAT ARE THE CHARGES OR MANAGEMENT DIRECTIVES UNDER WHICH THE DIFFERENT TYPES OF PLANNING ARE OCCURRING (STRATEGIC, LONG-RANGE, TACTICAL, OPERATIONAL)?
  - -- Issues that Planning is Directed to Address
  - -- Content (Elements, Organizational Units, Resources)
  - -- Role of Different Planning Participants, (Planning Committees, Planning Support Staff, Line Officers)
    - Identify Critical Issues
    - Assist Others in Performing Studies
    - Coordinate Assessments
    - Develop and Examine Alternatives
    - Advocate Action
- WHAT ARE THE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE DIFFERENT TYPES OF PLANNING ACTIVITIES THAT ARE ACTUALLY OCCURRING? (STRATEGIC, TACTICAL, OPERATIONAL)
  - -- Structure
    - Selection
    - Composition
    - Permanence
    - Responsibility
  - -- Planning Process
  - -- Analytic Support
- WHAT ARE THE MECHANISMS FOR LINKING THE PROCESSES AND RESULTS OF THE DIFFERENT TYPES OF PLANNING?
  - -- Strategic Planning to Orgainzational Planning
  - -- Long Term to Tactical Planning
  - -- Different Types of Tactical Planning (e.g., Program Evaluation to Resource Allocation)
  - -- Tactical to Operational Planning
  - -- Overall Organization of Planning
    - Role of Chief Executive Officer
    - Role of Planning Officer and Staff
    - Linkage of Planning to Governance
    - Administrative Responsibility for Different Types of Planning
    - Communication Network
  - -- What Provisions are there for Evaluating Planning?
- WHAT ARE SPECIAL LIMITATIONS TO THE POTENTIALS FOR PLANNING IN YOUR ORGANIZATION?

EXHIBIT 6
CHECKLIST FOR ANALYZING PLANNING ENVIRONMENT AND FOR LAUNCHING OR MODIFYING PLANNING ACTIVITIES (CONTINUED)

III. ASSESSMENT OF CHALLENGES FACING THE ORGANIZATION

- WHAT ARE THE TEN MAJOR CHALLENGES FACING YOUR ORGANIZATION?
- HOW MANY OF THESE ARE EXTERNAL AND HOW MANY ARE INTERNAL?
- HOW HAS PLANNING BEEN CHARGED TO DEAL WITH THESE CHALLENGES?
- WHAT ARE EMERGING CHALLENGES IN THE FUTURE? HOW CAN PLANNING DEAL WITH THESE TODAY?
- HOW CAN YOU MODIFY YOUR PLANNING ACTIVITIES (STRUCTURE, PROCESS, ANALYTIC SUPPORT) TO CONFRONT THESE CHALLENGES?

IV. IMPROVEMENTS IN PLANNING ACTIVITIES

- WHAT PLANNING ACTIVITIES CAN BE UNDERTAKEN TO YIELD IMMEDIATE RETURNS TO BUILD SUPPORT FOR PLANNING?
- WHAT ACTIVITIES CAN BE UNDERTAKEN TO IMPROVE AND FINE TUNE CURRENT PLANNING ACTIVITIES?
  - -- Strategic Planning
  - -- Tactical Planning
  - -- Operational Planning
  - -- Improve Linkages Between Different Types of Planning
  - -- Strengthen Supporters of Planning
  - -- Overcome Detractions of Planning
  - -- Improve Effectiveness of Communication of Results of Planning

3.0 A ROADMAP OF THE LITERATURE OF PLANNING

As discussed above, the new planner must use the literature on planning to sharpen insights on the principles of planning and to develop an ability to analyze the needs of the organization, the limitations of the role of planning, and the institutional history. Then the planner must develop and launch a strategy for planning within the context of sound planning principles.

A truly comprehensive bibliography of the literature of planning would consist of thousands of citations. Since planning is a pervasive behavior that is involved in every level of the strategic, management, and operational activities of organizations, there is scarcely an aspect of administrative behavior that is not somehow related to planning. But much of the planning literature is redundant, prescriptive and/or related to particular circumstances, or overly general in nature. The references contained in this monograph consist of many of the major, recent works on planning, divided into a number of categories relating to the level and functional areas of planning. As in all such bibliographies and classification schemes, many excellent works have been excluded, and those that have been included have been categorized broadly.

As you analyze and map the planning needs of your organization and devise a strategy for dealing with them, you should identify those aspects of planning on which information from the literature would assist your critical thinking. The following discussion begins with a brief historical context for evaluating and classifying the importance of different planning practices and their associated support literature. Then we present a short list of basic references which we believe that all planners should have at their disposal regardless of the more specific planning issues of immediate concern in any particular setting. Then a selection of the most important references is presented in several topical categories, with these references further subdivided into "critical," recent," and "classic" selections, thus enabling a planner confronted with a particular set of challenges to assemble a reading list of ten or fifteen useful references for review. Remember, however, that the

purpose of these readings is to assist you in critically analyzing your unique planning needs, not to find a cookbook answer in the literature.

3.1 THE EVOLUTION OF PLANNING IN HIGHER EDUCATION

This monograph would be very different if it had been written five, ten, or twenty years ago. The challenges and conditions facing higher education have changed significantly over that period, requiring changes in the nature of institutional decision making and changes in the techniques and applications of planning utilized by colleges and universities to support those decisions. Exhibits 7 and 8 summarize these developments by examining the characteristics of different eras of planning and decision making in higher education.

While the boundaries of the eras are somewhat artificial, they do suggest some interesting relationships. As the exhibits suggest, the late 1950's and early 1960's witnessed the growth of pressures for departure from the incremental, nonparticipatory styles of planning and decision making that characterized the educational leadership of that period. Colleges and universities needed new approaches in order to deal with the "tidal wave of new students" and the growth of research and graduate study. Master planning and information-based decision making grappled with the facilities and programmatic challenges posed not only by larger numbers of new students, but also by new student clienteles. The growing size and complexity of institutions were accompanied by more participatory decision making and some decentralization of power, although decision making continued to be largely incremental and political.

The application of management science techniques to higher education, a primary characteristic of the 1960's, denotes the decision making and planning style of this era as the *Age of Developing Quantitative Techniques*. The growth of administrative computing on campus began to make new information available to decision makers, and many experimented with quantitative models and other management science techniques at more progressive institutions. Examples of these quantitative techniques included Judy and Levine's Comprehensive Analytical Method for Planning in University Systems (CAMPUS) Model at the University of Toronto; the program of quantitative analysis and cost simulation undertaken with Ford Foundation support at Berkeley; the Resource Requirements Prediction Model (RPPM) developed by the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems in the late 1960's/early 1970's; some quantitatively oriented approaches that were included in the Carnegie Commission's omnibus series of studies on higher education; and the development of enrollment projection and manpower forecasting techniques. During this period, institutional research and quantitative support of planning grew in institutions. Rourke and Brooks captured the changing nature of institutional decision making in *The Managerial Revolution in Higher Education*, which

EXHIBIT 7: ERAS IN PLANNING AND DECISION MAKING

ERA	CONDITIONS	PRIMARY FOCUS	NATURE OF INSTITUTIONAL DECISION MAKING	NATURE OF PLANNING AND STRATEGY FORMULATION
1950'S AGE OF AUTHORITY	o Relatively stable conditions o Goal consensus o New institutional types o Steady growth	o Facilities o New institution studies	o Less participatory, administrative fiat	o Continuation of traditional, less sophisticated modes of planning and strategy
1960'S AGE OF DEVELOPING QUANTITATIVE TECHNIQUES	o Rapid growth in enrollment masks many problems o Expansion embraces new student clienteles o Student dissension changes relationships	o Facilities o Institution self-studies o New programs o Student studies	o More participatory o Dispersal of power o Talk rational, but decision making continues to be predominantly incremental, political, non-rationalistic	o Physical master planning o Experimentation with management science techniques o Emergence of institutional research and planning o State system planning
1970'S AGE OF PRAGMATIC APPLICATION	o Stabilizing enrollments o Revenue shortfalls o Need to reallocate resources to deal with imbalances caused by 1960's growth o Selective growth and retrenchment and promise of decline in 1980's o Goal fragmentation	o Internal Orientation o Existing programs o Resources o Efficiency o Recruitment o State relations	o Reallocation mentality o Incremental, imperfect decision making continues o Some institutions take advantage of continued growth in late 1970's to prepare for 1980's o Others wait for conditions to get so bad they will have to act	o Comprehensive master plans o Program planning and evaluation o Resource reallocation o Management of decline o New techniques and advances, in management science applications o Planning as staff function o Strategic management emerges in late 1970's
1980'S AGE OF STRATEGIC REDIRECTION	o Substantial decline in numbers of traditional college cohorts o Decline in many institutions, substantial regional and institutional variations o Resource shortfalls o Changes in student characteristics o Need to invest large sums in computing, scientific equipment, and capital plant for research and graduate education	o External orientation o Effectiveness o Quality o Outcomes o Competitive advantage o Economic development o Telematics	o Proactive relationship to environment o External environment affects internal decision making o Continued imperfections in decision making, but harsh penalties for poor decisions or deferral of choices o Enhanced use of analysis and decision support systems o Information management is key	o Strategic planning gains popularity o Re-emergence of master planning o Selective focus on new clienteles, new partnerships, external relationships o Experiences with shortcomings of analysis and planning o Emphasis on applications rather than techniques o Planning as line function, dispersed through organization

FROM NORRIS & POULTON IN PETERSON & METS (1987).

EXHIBIT 8: DEVELOPMENT OF INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING ACTIVITIES

DIMENSION	1950's	1960's	1970's	1980's
ACADEMIC	• Institutional self-study • New units	• Student studies • New institutions	• Program planning, evaluation • Enrollment forecasing • Recruitment need/demand	• Marketing • Retention • Human resources • Outcomes • Replacement • New Priorities • New delivery systems • New roles/behaviors
PHYSICAL	• Campus • Facility	• Space utilization	• Facility condition • Energy • Retro-fitting	• Replacement • Learning network of campus/environs
RESOURCES	• Early fiscal analysis	• Budget projections	• PPBS and other budget strategies • Modeling, simulation • Financial forecasting • Cost-benefit	• Planning software • Capital financing • Fund raising • Information as resource • New sources
OTHER			• Master planning • State relations	• Environmental scanning • Futuring • Regional or economic development • New partnership

ADAPTED FROM PETERSON (1986).

described the growing influence of information, research, and objective criteria in decision making. But the planning, strategy, and policy challenges facing institutions in the 1960's dealt with choosing among positive alternatives, namely providing greater resources devoted to expanding higher education. More difficult challenges would follow in the 1970's.

The development of management-science support tools continued at an increased pace into the 1970's as more mature versions of tools introduced in the 1960's helped shape plans, strategies, and policies. Initially the emphasis continued to be more on technique, rather than on application. But the overriding strategic planning issue in the 1970's was selective growth and retrenchment, rather than overall expansion. Through the research and analytical approaches of David Breneman, Allan Cartter, Richard Freeman, and others, colleges and universities identified the possibilities of enrollment declines driven by demographic changes, surpluses of doctoral educated professionals, and other manpower imbalances. By the last half of the 1970's, authors began to speak of education in terms of the "management of decline." Resource allocation and redistribution challenges spawned the use of new sets of qualitative and quantitative analytical approaches that dealt with difficult choices and trade-offs among competing resource demands. Quantitative financial planning models, such as EDUCOM's Educational Financial Planning Model, supported this thrust. Institutional research and planning grew in support of these functions, and planners increasingly served as staff in developing formal, often comprehensive, planning processes in many colleges and universities. Much of the thrust of planning was reactive, however, responding to environmental conditions after they became clear. The focus on problem solving and planning under apparently immutable conditions of fiscal stress led us to characterize the 1970's era as the *Age of Pragmatism*.

Another significant legacy of the 1970's was a healthy awareness on the part of decision makers of the limitations of different planning and policy support tools. The professional literature on management science, operations research, management information systems, and planning had offered decision makers tools that were overly prescriptive and technical, often inflexible, and unduly focussed on techniques, to the exclusion of many critical factors of successful implementation. Program budgeting, zero based budgeting, and related techniques of resource allocation and budgetary support ignored many of the realities of the functioning organization. The title of Aaron Wildavsky's article, "If Planning is Everything, Maybe It's Nothing," suggests the frustration with oversold techniques and formalized, prescriptive approaches.

By the start of the 1980's decision makers had begun to embrace "strategic management" as a way of managing an organization with an eye to the environment. The conditions of potential demographic decline carried over into the 1980's, but colleges and universities were confronted with additional challenges that required more enlightened action than merely dividing up pieces of a declining pie. Changing student characteristics – such as increases in older students, international students, and Hispanic and Orien-

tal minority students – required more proactive responses. There were also needs to invest huge sums of money in new information and telecommunications systems, personal computers, scientific equipment, and capital plant for research and graduate education. Opportunities and challenges arose for universities to join with industry and government in support of economic development. Faculty shortfalls in growth areas such as business and engineering needed to be overcome. These and similar issues turned the attention of leadership to focus on external developments and alternate funding resources outside the university.

These challenges have encouraged leaders to move beyond incremental solutions and focus on strategic planning approaches which have also emerged during this period. Keller characterizes these approaches as a "third way" that incorporates the best aspects of rational and political/incremental decision making. More leaders are taking proactive stances in relation to the environment rather than the reactive stances that have traditionally characterized responses to decline. Master planning has reemerged, but with a more proactive, change-agent orientation and with a focus on outcomes, program quality, and institutional effectiveness.

These changes have altered the focus of both the current and future activities of planning, strategy, and policy formulation for institutional decision makers. Information and analysis are critical, but less importance is placed upon technique, and more emphasis is given to distilling information to a manageable level and limiting its use in a manner appropriate for the given application. Planning support remains a staff function, but planning itself is a line function, the responsibility of institutional leaders. The institution/environment interface is more complex, and external factors are viewed as more manipulable, or even controllable, than was previously thought. Institutional leaders find themselves in an *Age of Strategic Redirection*, with planning, strategy, and policy focusing on quality, outcomes, and external relationships.

3.2 HOW LITERATURE AND RESEARCH HAVE KEPT PACE WITH THE FIELD

Higher education has always drawn heavily from other disciplines to support its planning endeavors. Many of the seminal articles and books on management applications in higher education were developed as specialized applications by economists, social psychologists, or political scientists examining higher education as an interesting and underdeveloped field of study. The following "classics" remain useful as a basic foundation of applications and illustrate how this area has drawn from other fields.

From business and corporate planning, higher education has drawn from many basic texts that have stimulated thought on planning and strategy formulation. Examples include Herbert Simon's *Administrative Behavior*, Robert Anthony's *Planning and Control Systems*, Robert Ackoff's *A Concept of Corporate Planning*, Peter Drucker's works, including *Management:*

Tasks, Responsibilities and Practices, David Ewing's *The Human Side of Planning*, and Schendel and Hofer's *Strategic Management: A New View of Business Policy*.

Political science and public administration have yielded the best works on policy analysis, especially in the public sector, on the importance of implementation, and on the politics of the budget process. Charles Lindblom's articles on "The Science of Muddling Through" and "Still Muddling, Not Yet Through" cast light on the strengths and limitations of incrementalism. Rourke and Brooks' *The Managerial Revolution in Higher Education* was a political science venture into higher education. Bardach's *The Implementation Game* contains many lessons for higher education, as does Wildavsky's *The Politics of the Budgetary Process*.

From organizational behavior have come contributions that have focused on the higher education setting, such as Burton Clark's "The Organizational Saga in Higher Education," Cohen and March's *Leadership and Ambiguity*, and March's "Emerging Developments in the Study of Organizations." Havelock's *Change Agent's Guide to Innovation in Education* and Rogers and Shoemaker's *Communication of Innovations* applied the concepts of the diffusion of innovations to a variety of organizational settings, including higher education.

Management science has applied many techniques developed in other settings to higher education. Most have focused on operational, rather than strategic, issues. Several books which have dealt with management science applications in higher education have included Balderston's *Managing Today's University*, Hopkins and Massey's *Planning Models for Colleges and Universities*, Lawrence and Service's *Quantitative Approaches to Higher Education Management*, and Anthony and Herzlinger's *Management Control in Non-Profit Organizations*.

The relationships among the literature, research, and practice of planning in higher education follow a pattern typical of the diffusion and adoption of innovations. Fundamental organizational research or new techniques originate in the social science disciplines or the applied management disciplines, as noted above. Problems and pressing issues in higher education prompt inquiry and research on the application of the emerging concepts or techniques to the higher education setting. Leading institutions experiment with new ideas, such as Stanford University's application of financial planning models and establishment of a computer-intensive environment. Articles on pioneering applications gain attention. As results emerge and trends are identified, a major review is published highlighting the developments of an era. Rourke and Brooks' *Managerial Revolution in High Education* and Keller's *Academic Strategy* are two of several such examples. These volumes prompt dissemination and provide interest in further research into higher education applications. As the area matures further, the emphasis continues to shift to insightful application and becomes part of the accepted practice of higher education.

With the development of a larger cadre of higher education profession-

als who have greater sophistication in planning techniques and applications, there will continue to be increased interest in developing and researching these applications. However, it is likely that new concepts will continue to come from the basic social science and management science disciplines, and the cutting edge will continue to reside with educational leaders who experiment with applying new techniques in leading institutions. The true critical success factor in planning is insightful application, not technical virtuosity, and by the time an approach reaches that state of evolution, it is part of the mainstream of planning.

3.3 A SHORT LIST OF REFERENCES

The particular collection of readings which the planner needs to review depends upon the nature of the challenges which he is facing and his background. In our judgment, there is a short list of references that are especially good in discussing the historical context of planning and decision making in higher education, the concepts of strategic planning and futures techniques, and a wide variety of strategic and tactical planning topics. Exhibit 9 describes in a summary fashion the contents and typical areas covered by our recommended short list. The following section provides annotations for each entry of the short list.

In reality, the planner should choose from this short list, and from the more detailed bibliography that follows, a more extensive, tailored selection of readings that fit the needs of the situation. The bibliographic listing is organized by topic area, with each topic area further subdivided into "critical" reading, "recent" selections, and "classic" selections.

Peterson, M. W. & Mets, L. A., eds. *Key Resources on Higher Education Governance, Management and Leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1987.

This volume is a current, comprehensive guide to reference resources on governance, management, and leadership in higher education intended for use by practicing administrators, faculty, and students. Each chapter presents an overview of the topic, a framework for organizing the literature, and a commentary on how the literature has developed and on the current status of the topic. The annotations contain evaluative comments about how and to whom the work may be useful. A wide range of sub-topics, encompassing all areas of strategic and tactical planning, are covered in more than twenty chapters. This is a critical reference volume for planners.

Jedamus, P., Peterson, M. W., & Associates. *Improving Academic Management*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.

EXHIBIT 9
A CRITICAL SHORT LIST OF PLANNING REFERENCES

SOURCE	AUTHOR	DESCRIPTION	TOPICAL AREA
Key Resources on Higher Education Governance, Management and Leadership 1987	Peterson & Mets	A comprehensive, up-to-date reference on not only planning, but governance, management and leadership in higher education. A must reference	All Topical Areas
Improving Academic Management 1984	Jedamus & Peterson	Comprehensive handbook of planning and institutional research	All Topical Areas
Leadership and Ambiguity: The American College President 1974	Cohen & March	Explores the decision making environment in which planning operates	Planning Context
"Comprehensive and Incremental Decision Paradigms and Their Implications for Educational Planning" Planning and Vocational Education 1982	Schmidtlein	Discussion of decision making in higher education	Planning Context
Academic Strategy: The Management Revolution in American Higher Education 1983	Keller	Historical development of planning and emergence of strategic planning	History of Planning/ Critique of Planning/ Strategic Planning
Strategic Management: A New View of Business Policy and Planning 1979	Schendel & Hofer	Blend of theory, research and practice of strategic management in business and higher education	Strategic Planning/ Strategic Management
Strategic Planning, Management and Decision Making 1981	Cope	Concise but complete discussion of strategic planning in higher education	Strategic Planning/ Strategic Management
"Identifying the Levels of Strategy for a College or University," Long Range Planning 1983	Shirley	Alternate framework for linking strategy and management in higher education	Strategic Planning/ Strategic Management
"Strategic Goals, Process and Politics" "Strategic Change: Logical Incrementalism" "Managing Strategic Change" Sloan Management Review 1977-1980	Quinn	Discusses research on the management of strategic change in large organizations and the evolution of "logical incrementalism", a concept applicable to higher education	Strategic Planning
"Backward Mapping: Implementation Research and Policy Decisions" Political Science Quarterly 1980	Elmore	Article yielding important insights on the difficulties of policy implementation and planning	Planning Context/ Strategic Planning/ Tactical Planning
Futures Research and the Strategic Planning Process: Implications for Higher Education 1984	Morrison, Renfro, and Boucher	Discusses the details of futures techniques and the integration of futures techniques with strategic planning and details techniques	Futures Technique/ Strategic Planning

This volume is a comprehensive handbook of planning and institutional research. Peterson's chapter provides the broad framework for the discussions of planning for all the chapters in the handbook. This chapter defines planning from several perspectives, presents the major theoretical models and approaches to planning, and discusses the relationships among the environment, strategic planning, and tactical planning. It concludes by reviewing the major institutional issues in developing an institutional planning function. This handbook is one of the earlier resources in the higher education literature to provide the perspectives needed to extend planning practices from the more formalistic and tactical approaches toward the current attention to strategic planning and environmental issues.

Cohen, M. D. and March, J. G. *Leadership and Ambiguity: The American College President*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974.

Only half of this volume deals specifically with the careers, images, functions, and tenure of the college president. The other half describes models of governance and the processes of choice in the university. The university is characterized as an "organized anarchy," i.e., an organization that has problematic goals, unclear technology, and fluid participation. The tasks of goal setting, planning, and organization change are among many topics discussed. The volume includes advice on how to facilitate action in the university setting; hence it is a valuable reference to the practitioner.

Schmidtlein, F. A. "Comprehensive and Incremental Decision Paradigms and Their Implications for Educational Planning." In G. H. Copa and J. Moss, eds. *Planning and Vocational Education*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1983, 48-80.

Two competing paradigms for organizational decision making are developed. The comprehensive/prescriptive paradigm incorporates concepts of planning, operations research, systems analysis, and decision analysis. The incremental/remedial paradigm is based upon concepts of 'market' economics and political bargaining processes. Several process and value orientations of these paradigms are presented as well as several time and resource constraints that affect specific decisions.

Keller, G. *Academic Strategy: The Management Revolution in American Higher Education*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1983.

This book resulted from a nationwide study of management practices in a wide variety of colleges and universities in the early 1980's. Keller describes the historical development of planning, management leadership in higher education, and the emerging emphasis on academic strategy and strategic

planning. He describes academic strategies as a means of moving beyond the limitations of normative, rigid planning, on the one hand, and traditional incrementalism, on the other. Keller provides excellent discussions of the contextual and historical development of planning in higher education, the strengths and limitations of incrementalism and prescriptive planning, and the importance of leadership. The bibliography and references are essential to any planner. His characterizations of success factors for planning are good, but are more abstract than operational. Keller's sense of new planning directions and techniques is less successful than the other contents of this excellent volume.

Schendel, D. E. and Hofer, C. W., eds. *Strategic Management: A New View of Business Policy and Planning*. Boston: Little Brown, 1979.

This volume is based on a collection of papers commissioned for a 1977 conference. The objectives were these: 1) to define the dimensions and boundaries of business policy, strategic management, and planning; 2) to identify opportunities and needs for research; and 3) to help researchers, practitioners, and students better understand the implications of these newer approaches to organizational integration. Ten topics are covered including strategy and strategic management; goals and goal formation; strategy formulation, evaluation, and implementation; theory building and testing; and practitioners' views. Although oriented toward business, one chapter is concerned with not-for-profit organizations including higher education. References to the higher education literature are dated. Nevertheless, this reference contains a blend of theory, research, and practice, and provides a useful source for those seeking to understand the historical roots of the strategic policy and planning area.

Cope, R. G. *Strategic Planning, Management and Decision Making*. AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 9. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1981.

This publication presents one of the most concise and complete discussions of strategic planning and management as applied to higher education. The monograph contrasts the differences between long-range and strategic planning concepts, presents the intellectual foundations of strategic planning, discusses many of the emerging techniques, and formulates a research agenda for studying the further application of strategic planning concepts in higher education. This publication is essential reading for both newcomers and experienced practitioners. Concepts are presented succinctly, and resources are identified for further investigation. For the interested reader, other subsequent works by Cope, referenced under the following section on strategic planning, extend and update his thinking.

Shirley, R. C. "Identifying the Levels of Strategy for a College or University." *Long Range Planning*, 1983, *16* (3), 92–98.

Shirley outlines six decision areas that accomplish the overall function of strategy and discusses how they apply to the nonprofit sector, specifically higher education. The six areas include basic mission, clientele, goals, program/service mix, geographic service area, and comparative advantage. Shirley also contrasts four levels of decision making in the university. These levels include institutional strategy, campus-wide functional strategies, program strategies, and program-level functional strategies. This article is important for the planner and institutional leader, for it provides an operational, decision based framework for organizing a strategic planning process and shows how strategy at the institutional level gets translated into strategy plus tactical and operational plans at the program level.

Quinn, J. B. "Strategic Goals: Process and Politics." *Sloan Management Review*, 1977, *19* (1), 21–37.

Quinn, J. B. "Strategic Change: Logical Incrementalism." *Sloan Management Review*, 1978, *20* (1), 7–21.

Quinn, J. B. "Managing Strategic Change." *Sloan Management Review*, 1980, *21* (4), 3–20.

This series of three articles reports on the results of extensive research on the management of strategic change in large organizations. The author demonstrates why executives do not follow formal, textbook approaches; instead, an integrative methodology called "logical incrementalism" is described, which blends formal analysis, behavioral techniques, and power politics to achieve cohesive, deliberate movement. It is argued that the ends or strategic goals are only broadly conceived at the initiation of change and are then refined and reshaped as new information is acquired. All three articles present guidelines using actual examples on how to manage change processes. These results, also applicable to the higher education setting, are important for both leadership and staff support roles.

Elmore, R. F. "Backward Mapping: Implementation Research and Policy Decisions." *Political Science Quarterly*, 1979–80, *94* (4), 601–616.

Elmore contends that most policy making is flawed because it focuses on the front end of the policy-making process, which contends with goals, organizational intent, and hierarchy, rather than with the back end of the policy-making process, namely implementation, where 90 percent of the variation between policy intent and actuality occurs. Elmore suggests backward mapping: a process in which policy makers examine how and by whom policies will be implemented and then craft their policies to recognize the characteristics of the implementers and the variability and situational nature of the

implementation environment. This is an excellent, context-establishing article which yields important insights on the difficulties of policy implementation. It has useful insights for planners, too, who must deal with the uncertainties of extrapolating the impacts of plans on operating units and understand how strategy and tactics are translated and filtered by implementing units.

Morrison, J. L., Renfro, W. L., and Boucher, W. I. *Futures Research and the Strategic Planning Process: Implications for Higher Education.* AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 9. Washington, D.C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education, 1984.

This publication presents a concise, yet thorough, development of a strategic planning process that combines the more traditional long-range planning cycle (goal setting, implementing, monitoring, and forecasting) with an environmental scanning cycle (scanning, evaluation/ranking, forecasting, and monitoring). The former maintains an internal perspective, while the latter is directed externally. Six components are discussed, giving special attention to the techniques (including examples) of environmental scanning, issues evaluation, and forecasting. Discussions cover many topics ranging across scanning taxonomies, impact networks, the Delphi technique, cross-impact analysis, scenario building, and others. A valuable reference source for the leader, planner, or faculty member new to the applications of futures techniques, this publication also provides many citations for pursuing techniques and applications in greater depth. For the interested reader, other citations on futuring and related techniques are contained later in this bibliography.

4.0 BIBLIOGRAPHY OF PLANNING

4.1 NATURE AND HISTORY OF PLANNING

A significant portion of the planning literature deals with basic definitions, theories, and principles of planning, and/or the history of planning in higher education. If not selected carefully, the general planning literature can be prescriptive, normative, and unsuited to the higher education environment. The works we have selected here provide both a sound definitional basis and a grounding in historical development that serve as a roadmap in applying planning in higher education.

Critical Reading

Keller, G. *Academic Strategy: The Management Revolution in American Higher Education*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1983.

Peterson, M. W. "Analyzing Alternative Approaches to Planning." In P. Jedamus, M. W. Peterson, & Associates, *Improving Academic Management*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980, 113-163.

Recent Selections

Hudson, B. "Planning: Typologies, Issues, and Application Contexts." *Planning and Vocational Education*. Edited by G. H. Copa and J. Moss. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1983, 18-44.

Norris, D. M. and Mims, R. S. "A New Maturity for Institutional Planning and Information Management." *Journal of Higher Education*, 1984, *55* (6), 700-718.

Pennings, J. M. and Associates. *Organizational Strategy and Change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1985.

Peterson, M. W. "Continuity, Challenge and Change: An Organizational Perspective on Planning Past and Future." *Planning for Higher Education*, 1986, *14* (3), 6-15.

Classic Selections

Ackoff, R. *A Concept of Corporate Planning*. New York: John Wiley, 1970.
Anthony, R. N. *Planning and Control Systems: A Framework for Analysis*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1965.
Balderston, F. E. *Managing Today's University*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.
Bracker, J. "The Historical Development of the Strategic Management Concept." *Academy of Management Review*, 1980, *5* (2), 219-224.
Friedman, J. and Hudson, B. "Knowledge and Action: A Guide to Planning Theory." *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, 1974,*40* (1), 2-16.
Jones, L. R. "A Historical Survey of Academic Planning Development." *Planning for Higher Education*, 1979, *7* (5), 21-27.
Michael, D. N. *On Learning to Plan and Planning to Learn*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.
Richardson, R. C., Gardner, D. E. and Pierce, A. "The Need for Institutional Planning." *ERIC Research Currents*, September 1977.
Rourke, F. and Brooks, G. *The Managerial Revolution in Higher Education*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1966.
Sibley, W. H. "Planning for Universities: The Contemporary Predicament." *International Journal of Institutional Management in Higher Education*, 1977, *1* (2), 85-96.

Classic Selections: Handbooks and Prescriptive Models

Cope, R. *Strategic Policy Planning: A Guide for College and University Administrators*. Littleton, CO: Ireland Educational Corporation, 1978.
Dror, Y. "The Planning Process: A Facet Design." In Y. Dror, *Ventures in Policy Sciences*. New York: Elsevier, 1971, 99-117.
Hollowood, J. R. "College and University Strategic Planning: A Methodological Approach." *Planning for Higher Education*, 1981, *9* (4),8-18.
Kieft, R. N., Armijo, F., & Bucklew, N. *A Handbook for Institutional Academic and Program Planning: From Idea to Implementation*. Boulder, CO: NCHEMS, 1978.
Millet, J. D. *Planning in Higher Education: A Manual for Colleges and Universities*. Washington, D.C.: Academy for Educational Development, 1977.
National Association of College and University Business Officers. *A College Planning Cycle: People, Resources, Process*. Washington, D.C.: NACUBO, 1975.
Parekh, S. *Long Range Planning*. New Rochelle, NY: Change Magazine Press, 1977.

4.2 PLANNING CONTEXT

The decision making context in higher education must be understood if the planner is to apply successfully the concepts of planning. This under-

standing is critical in interpreting some of the planning texts which have excellent theoretical content but have been developed and written for the business environment. The following selections are especially helpful in establishing this planning context.

Critical Reading

Cohen, M. D. and March, J. G. *Leadership and Ambiguity: The American College President*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974.

Elmore, R. F. "Backward Mapping: Implementation Research and Policy Decisions." *Political Science Quarterly*, 1979-80, *94* (4), 601-616.

McConnell, T. R. and Mortimer, K. P. *Sharing Authority Effectively*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.

Peterson, M. W. "Emerging Developments in Postsecondary Organization Theory and Research: Fragmentation or Integration?" *Educational Researcher*, 1985, *3* (14), 5-12.

Schmidtlein, F. A. "Comprehensive and Incremental Decision Paradigms and Their Implications for Educational Planning." *Planning and Vocational Education*. Edited by G. H. Copa and J. Moss. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1983, 48-80.

Recent Selections

Alpert, D. "Performance and Paralysis: The Organizational Context of the American Research University." *Journal of Higher Education*, 1985, *56* (3), 241-251.

Clark, B. R. *The Higher Education System: Academic Organization in Cross-National Perspective*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1983.

March, J. G. "Emerging Developments in the Study of Organizations." *The Review of Higher Education*, 1982, *6* (1), 1-18.

Peterson, M. W., ed. *ASHE Reader on Organization and Governance in Higher Education*. 3rd ed. Lexington, MA: Ginn Press, 1986.

Schmidtlein, F. A. "Patterns of Institutional Governance and Decision Making Process." *Key Resources on Higher Education Governance, Management and Leadership*. Edited by M. W. Peterson and L. A. Mets. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1987.

Classic Selections

Anthony, R. N. and Herzlinger, R. *Management Control in Non-Profit Organizations*. Homewood, IL: Irwin, 1975.

Baldridge, J. V. *Power and Conflict in the University*. New York: John Wiley, 1971.

Baldridge, J. V., Curtis, D. V., Ecker, G., and Riley, G. L. *Policy Making and Effective Leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.

Beneviste, G. *The Politics of Expertise*. 2nd ed. Berkeley, CA: Glendessary, 1971.

Clark, B. R. "The Organizational Saga in Higher Education." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 1972, *17* (2), 178–184.
Cohen, M. D., March, J. G., and Olsen, J. P. "A Garbage Can Model of Organizational Choice." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 1972, *17*, 1–5.
Cyert, R. M. *Management of Non-Profit Organizations*. Boston: D. C. Heath, 1975.
Drucker, P. F. *Management: Tasks, Responsibilities, and Practices*. New York: Harper and Row, 1974.
Forester, J. "Bounded Rationality and the Politics of Muddling Through." *Public Administration Review*, 1984, *44* (1), 23–31.
Havelock, R. G. *The Change Agent's Guide to Innovation in Education*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology Publications, 1973.
Micek, S. S., ed. *Integrating Academic Planning and Budgeting in a Rapidly Changing Environment: Process and Technical Issues*. Boulder, CO: NCHEMS, 1980.
Minahan, J. P. "Decision Models for Academe." *Planning for Higher Education*, 1976, *5* (6).
Rogers, E. M. and Showmaker, F. F. *Communication of Innovations*. New York: Free Press, 1971.
Schmidtlein, F. A. "Decision Process Paradigms in Education." *Educational Researcher*, 1974, *3* (5), 4–11.
Simon, H. *Administrative Behavior*. New York: Free Press, 1957.
Weick, K. E. "Educational Organizations as Loosely Coupled Systems." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 1976, *21* (1), 1–19.

4.3 CRITIQUE OF PLANNING

Over the years, a significant subset of the planning literature has evaluated and contrasted the potentials and limitations of planning practice, often arising from frustrations with the current state of the art. A number of excellent articles establishes the relative strengths and weaknesses of incrementalism and strategic decision making. This literature is essential to the planner for maintaining balanced perspectives between desired and realistic outcomes for current and future planning activities.

Critical Reading

Keller, G. *Academic Strategy: The Management Revolution in American Higher Education*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1983.
Wildavsky, A. "If Planning is Everything, Maybe It's Nothing." *Policy Sciences*, 1973, *4* (2), 127–153.

Recent Selections

Baldridge, J. V. and Okimi, P. H. "Strategic Planning in Higher Education: New Tool – or New Gimmick?" *AAHE Bulletin*, 1982, *35* (2), 6 and 15–18.

James, B. G. "Strategic Planning Under Fire." *Sloan Management Review*, 1984, *25* (4), 57-61.

Classic Selections

Boulding, K. "Reflections on Planning: The Value of Uncertainty." *Technology Review*, 1974, *77* (1), 8.
Clark, D. L. "In Consideration of Goal-Free Planning: The Failure of Traditional Planning Systems in Education." *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 1981, *17* (3), 46-60.
Dresch, S. P. "A Critique of Planning Models for Postsecondary Education." *Journal of Higher Education*, 1975, *46* (1), 245-286.
Enarson, H. L. "The Art of Planning." *Educational Record*, 1975, *56*, 170-174.
Ewing, D. W. *The Human Side of Planning*. London: MacMillan Co., 1969.
Lindblom, C. E. "The Science of Muddling Through." *Public Administration Review*, 1959, *19* (2), 79-88.
Lindblom, C. E. "Still Muddling, Not Yet Through." *Public Administration Review*, 1979, *39* (6), 517-526.
Mandelbaum, S. J. "A Complete General Theory of Planning is Impossible." *Policy Sciences*, 1979, *11* (1), 59-71.
Millett, J. D. "Higher Education Management Versus Business Management." *Educational Record*, 1975, *56* (3), 170-174.
Moore, J. W. "Pragmatic Considerations in Academic Planning." *Planning for Higher Education*, 1976, *5* (6).
Poland, W. and Arns, R. G. "Characteristics of Successful Planning Activities." *Planning for Higher Education*, 1978, *7* (3), 1-6.
Richardson, R. C. and Gardner, D. E. "Avoiding Extremes in the Planning Continuum." *Journal of Higher Education*, 1983, *54* (2), 180-192.
Weidenbaum, M. and Rockwood, L. "Corporate Planning Versus Government Planning." *Public Interest*, Winter 1977, *46*, 59-72.

4.4 STRATEGIC PLANNING/STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT

Strategic planning is only one of the three types of planning – strategic, tactical, and operational. Within the literature on strategic planning is an excellent set of books, monographs, and articles which were selected to review the principles for strategic planning in general and provide guidelines for applying them to higher education. A separate literature from public administration, political science, and policy studies provides an excellent grounding in the principles of policy. Special areas of emphasis include implementing policies, reconciling politics with science in policy analysis, and evaluating policies. Much of the work of policy analysis is inherently tactical in nature. However, it is critical in establishing strategy to understand the strategic implications of the requirements for policy formulation. Our selections provide such a focus.

Critical Reading

Cope, R. G. *Strategic Planning, Management and Decision Making*. AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 9. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1981.

Mintzberg, H. and Waters, J. A. "Strategies, Deliberate and Emergent." *Strategic Management Journal*, 1985, *6* (3), 257-272.

Quinn, J. B. "Strategic Goals: Process and Politics." *Sloan Management Review*, 1977, *19* (1), 21-37.

Quinn, J. B. "Strategic Change: Logical Incrementalism." *Sloan Management Review*, 1978, *20* (1), 7-21.

Quinn, J. B. "Managing Strategic Change." *Sloan Management Review*, 1980, *21* (4), 3-20.

Schendel, D. E. and Hofer, C. W., eds. *Strategic Management: A New View of Business Policy and Planning*. Boston: Little, Brown, 1979.

Shirley, R. C. "Identifying the Levels of Strategy for a College or University." *Long Range Planning*, 1983, *16* (3), 92-98.

Recent Selections

Chaffee, E. E. "Successful Strategic Management in Small Private Colleges." *Journal of Higher Education*, 1984, *55* (2), 212-241.

Cope, R. G. "A Contextual Model to Encompass the Strategic Planning Concept: Introducing a Newer Paradigm." *Planning for Higher Education*, 1985, *13* (3), 13-20.

Eadie, D. C. "Putting a Powerful Tool to Practical Use: The Application of Strategic Planning in the Public Sector." *Public Administration Review*, 1983, *43* (5), 447-452.

Eadie, D. C., Ellison, N. M. and Brown, G. C. "Incremental Strategic Planning: A Creative Adaptation." *Planning Review*, 1982, *10* (3), 10-15.

Lelong, D. and Shirley, R. C. "Planning: Identifying the Focal Points for Action." *Planning for Higher Education*, 1984, *12* (4), 1-7.

Myran, Gundar A., ed. *Strategic Management in the Community College*. New Directions for Community Colleges, No. 44. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, December 1983.

Classic Selections

Abell, D. F. *Defining the Business: The Starting Point of Strategic Planning*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1980.

Anshoff, R. *Strategic Management*. New York: John Wiley, 1979.

Baldridge, J. V. "Managerial Innovation – Rules for Successful Implementation." *Journal of Higher Education*, 1980, *51* (2), 117-134.

Bardach, E. *The Implementation Game: What Happens After A Bill Becomes Law*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1977.

Brewer, G. D. "Where the Twain Meet: Reconciling Science and Politics in Analysis." *Policy Sciences*, 1981, *13* (3), 269-279.

Doyle, P. and Lynch, J. "Long Range Planning for Universities." *Long Range Planning*, 1976, 9.
Dror, Y. *Public Policymaking Reexamined*. 2nd ed. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books, 1983.
Drucker, P. F. "The Deadly Sins in Public Administration." *Public Administration Review*, 1980, *25* (1), 103-106.
Fincher, C. "Planning Models and Paradigms in Higher Education." *Journal of Higher Education*, 1972.
Frances, C. "Apocalyptic vs. Strategic Planning." *Change*, 1980, *12* (5), 19 and 39-44.
Gluck, F. W., Kaufman, S. P., and Walleck, A. S. "Strategic Management for Competitive Advantage." *Harvard Business Review*, 1980, *58* (4), 154-161.
Haas, R. M. "Winning Acceptance for Institutional Research and Planning." In P. Jedamus and M. W. Peterson, *Improving Academic Management*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980, 539-554.
Kotler, P. and Murphey, P. E. "Strategic Planning for Higher Education." *Journal of Higher Education*, 1981, *52* (5), 470-489.
Lelong, D. C. and Hinman, M. M. *Implementation of Formal Planning: Strategies for the Large University*. Ann Arbor, MI: Center for the Study of Higher Education, 1982.
Mayhew, L. B. *Surviving the Eighties: Strategies and Procedures for Solving Fiscal and Enrollment Problems*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1979.
Palumbo, D. J. ed. "Symposium on Optimizing, Implementing and Evaluating Public Policy." *Policy Studies Journal*, 1980, *8* (3).
Paul, R. N., Donovan, N. B., and Taylor, J. W. "The Reality Gap in Strategic Planning." *Harvard Business Review*, 1978, *56* (3), 124-130.
Porter, R., Oedel, P., and Zemsky, R. "Adaptive Planning: The Role of Institution Specific Models" *Journal of Higher Education*, 1979, *56* (5), 586-601.
Poulton, N. L., ed. *Evaluation of Management and Planning Systems*. New Directions for Institutional Research No. 31. San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass, 1981.
Pressman, J. and Wildavsky, A. *Implementation*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1973.
Shirley, R. C. "Limiting the Scope of Strategy: A Decision Based Approach." *Academy of Management Review*, 1982, *7* (2), 262-268.
Wildavsky, A. *Speaking Truth to Power: The Art and Craft of Policy Analysis*. Boston: Little, Brown, 1979.
Wortman, M. S., Jr. "Strategic Management and Changing Leader-Follower Roles." *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 1982, *18* (3), 371-383.

4.5 NEW DIRECTIONS IN PLANNING

There are a number of new directions in planning which have special attention for future applications. In some cases these are old areas which are experiencing a renaissance or new level of importance based on emerging

conditions. These areas will, over time, be absorbed into the mainstream of planning theory and practice.

Futures Techniques

This area has been developing in the corporate world for a number of years. Through the efforts of James Morrison and other futurists, these techniques have been applied to higher education and are being utilized in a number of institutions. The literature is relatively well developed but is lacking in excellent case studies of successful application, which should be appearing in the next several years.

Critical Reading

Callan, P. M., ed. *Environmental Scanning for Strategic Leadership*. New Directions for Institutional Research No. 52. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1986.

Morrison, J. L., Renfro, W. L., and Boucher, W. I. *Futures Research and the Strategic Planning Process: Implications for Higher Education*. AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 9. Washington, D.C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education, 1984.

Morrison, J. L. "Establishing an Environmental Scanning/Forecasting System to Augment College and University Planning." *Planning for Higher Education*, 1987, *15* (1), 7-22.

Recent Selections

Hearn, J. C. and Heydinger, R. B. "Scanning the University's External Environment – Objectives, Constraints, Possibilities." *Journal of Higher Education*, 1985 *56* (4), 419-445.

Lozier, G. G. and Chittipeddi, K. "Issues Management in Strategic Planning." *Research in Higher Education*, 1986, *24* (1), 3-14.

Morrison, J. L., Renfro, W. L., and Boucher, W. I., eds., *Applying Methods and Techniques of Futures Research*. New Directions for Institutional Research No. 39. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1983.

Zentner, Rene D. "Scenarios, Past, Present and Future." *Long Range Planning*, 1982, *15* (3), 12-20.

Classic Selections

Harman, W. W. *An Incomplete Guide to the Future*. San Francisco: San Francisco Book Co., 1976.

Kirschling, W. R. and Huckfeldt, V. E. "Projecting Alternative Futures." In P. Jedamus, M. W. Peterson, & Associates, *Improving Academic Management*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980, 200-215.

Competitive Advantage

The competitive advantage literature is well developed in the business sector. The concept has also been applied to higher education in the areas of student choice and institutional attractiveness and in case studies at institutions such as Carnegie Mellon, which have embraced the competitive advantage concept. What is lacking are examples of a broader set of applications of competitive advantage and descriptions of emerging institutional cultures in complex settings that weave together the results and interrelationships of a number of individual measures of the competitive study of particular programs. Our selections provide a grounding in the concepts of competitive advantage and some application to higher education.

Critical Reading

Porter, M. E. *Competitive Advantage–Creating and Sustaining Superior Performance*. New York: Free Press, 1985.

Recent Selections

Benjamin, R. I., Rockart, J. F., Scott Morton, M. S., and Wyman, J. "Information Technology: A Strategic Opportunity." *Sloan Management Review*, 1984, *25* (3), 3–10.

Keen, P. *Competing in Time: Using Telecommunications for Competitive Advantage*. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger, 1987.

Ohmae, K. *The Mind of the Strategist: Business Planning for Competitive Advantage*. New York: Penguin Books, 1982.

Rowse, G. L. and Wing, P. "Assessing Competitive Structures in Higher Education." *Journal of Higher Education*, 1982, *53* (6), 656–686.

New External Relationships

The literature on new external relationships is well developed in establishing the historical antecedents and the current/future reasons for education, industry, and government joining forces in new ways. There are also reports identifying the kinds of initiatives that have worked in the past to establish research parks or other cooperative ventures. What is needed and will help greatly in future efforts are strategic evaluations describing which new organizational forms are working in the environment of the late 1980's and which of these will likely work in the future.

Critical Reading

Botkin, J. and Dimanesceu, D. *The New Alliance–America's New R&D Consortia*. New York: Harper & Row, 1981.

Matthews, J. B. and Norgaard, R. *Managing the Partnership Between Higher Education and Industry*. Boulder, CO: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, 1984.

Recent Selections

Fink, I. "The Role of Land and Facilities in Fostering Linkages Between Universities and High Technology Industries." *Planning for Higher Education*, 1985, *13* (3), 1-12.

Johnson, G. L. *The High Technology Connection: Academic Industrial Cooperation for Economic Growth*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Research Report No. 6. Washington, D.C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education, 1984.

Lee, C. A. "Research Park Development from a University Relationships Perspective." *Planning for Higher Education*, 1983, *12* (1), 33-40.

Effectiveness, Quality, and Outcomes

While the evaluation of effectiveness, quality, and outcomes has a long history, the centrality of these issues to higher education leadership has increased materially in recent years. External pressures to improve and measure quality and outcomes are encouraging institutions to face these issues more systematically and not to leave them to the complete discretion of each individual academic unit. Furthermore, literature is emerging on dealing with institutional effectiveness, which promises to be a critical area of focus for planners.

Critical Reading

Cameron, K. S. "A Study of Organizational Effectiveness and Its Predictors." *Management Science*, 1986, *32* (1), 87-112.

Conrad, C. F. and Blackburn, R. T. "Program Quality in Higher Education: A Review and Critique of Literature and Research." In *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research, Vol. 1*. New York: Agathon Press, 283-308.

Ewell, P. *The Self-Regarding Institution: Information for Excellence*. Boulder, CO: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, 1984.

Stauffer, T. ed. *Quality – Higher Education's Principal Challenge*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1981.

Zammuto, R. F. "A Comparison of Multiple Constituency Models of Organizational Effectiveness." *Academy of Management Review*, 1984, *9* (4), 606-616.

Zammuto, R. F. *Assessing Organizational Effectiveness: System Change, Adaptation and Strategy*. Albany, N.Y.: SUNY Albany Press, 1982.

4.6 TACTICAL PLANNING

Within the context of the general readings on planning and the context established by strategic planning, there exists a number of tactical planning areas, each with its own literature. For the planner whose particular organi-

zational circumstance calls for a tactical approach, it makes sense to undertake some reading of the overall nature, history, context, and limitations of planning and strategic decision making, but to move quickly to the particular tactical area(s) of greatest interest.

There is a substantial and varied literature supporting the various permutations of tactical planning. Much of this literature is time stamped by the nature of the challenges facing higher education of particular points in time – such as the retrenchment, management of decline, and resource-allocation emphasis of the late 1970's, early 1980's. We have selected a broad range of bibliographic citations for a variety of tactical planning topics.

Budgeting and Resource Allocation

In reviewing the budgetary and resource allocation process as a basic component of tactical planning, a number of outstanding books and articles emerges.

Critical Reading

Hyatt, J. A., Shulman, C. H., and Santiago, A. A. *Reallocation: Strategies for Effective Resource Management*. Washington, D.C.: National Association of College and University Business Officers, 1984.

Leslie, L. L. "Financial Management and Resource Allocation." *Key Resources on Higher Education Governance, Management and Leadership*. Edited by M. W. Peterson and L. A. Mets. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1987.

Mingle, J. L., ed. *Management Flexibility and State Regulation in Higher Education*. Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1983.

Classic Selections

Caruthers, J. K. and Orwig, M. *Budgeting in Higher Education*. AAHE-ERIC Higher Education Research Report No. 3. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1979.

Gillis, A. L. "Program Choice/Resource Compaction." *Planning for Higher Education*, 1982, *10* (3), 33–38.

Heim, P. "Management Systems and Budgeting Methodology: Do They Meet the Needs and Will They Work?" *NACUBO Studies in Management*, 1972, *2* (2).

Lyden, J. "The Budget Cycle as a Basis for Decision Making in Higher Education." *Planning for Higher Education*, 1975, *4* (5).

Massy, W. F. "Resource Management and Financial Equilibrium." *NACUBO Professional Files*, October 1975.

Orwig, M. D. and Caruthers, J. K. "Selecting Budget Strategies and Priorities." In P. Jedamus, M. W. Peterson, & Associates, *Improving Academic Management*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980, 341–363.

Pfeffer, J. and Salancik, G. "Organizational Decision Making as a Political

Process: The Case of a University Budget." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 1974, *19* (1), 135-151.
Pfeffer, J. and Moore, W. L. "Power in University Budgeting: A Replication and Extension." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 1980, *25* (4), 637-653.
Wildavsky, A. *The Politics of the Budgetary Process*. 3rd ed. Boston: Little, Brown, 1979.
Wildavsky, A. "A Budget for All Seasons?: Why the Traditional Budget Lasts." *Public Administration Review*, 1978, *38* (6), 501-509.

Retrenchment and the Management of Decline

A key component of both the strategic and resource allocation responses of the universities to the conditions of the 1980's has been the whole issue of responding to retrenchment and to what Boulding referred to as "The Management of Decline" in his article in *Change* in 1975.

Critical Reading

Levine, C. H. and Rubin, I. *Fiscal Stress and Public Policy*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 1980.
Mingle, J. R. *The Challenges of Retrenchment*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1981.
Zammuto, R. F. "Managing Decline in American Higher Education." *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research*. Vol. 2. Edited by J. C. Smart. New York: Agathon Press, 1986.
Zammuto, R. F. and Cameron, K. S. "Environmental Decline and Organizational Response." *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 1985, *7*, 223-262.

Recent Selections

Cameron, K. "Strategic Responses to Conditions of Decline." *Journal of Higher Education*, 1983, *54* (4), 359-380.
Hirschhorn, L., ed. *Cutting Back: Retrenchment and Redevelopment in Human and Community Services*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1983.
Jick, T. D. and Murray, V. V. "The Management of Hard Times: Budget Cutbacks in Public Sector Organizations." *Organization Studies*, 1982, *3*, 141-169.
Kerchner, C. T. and Schuster, J. H. "The Uses of Crisis: Taking the Tide at the Flood." *Review of Higher Education*, 1982, *5* (3), 121-141.
Petrie, H. G. and Alpert, D. "What is the Problem of Retrenchment in Higher Education?" *Journal of Management Studies*, 1983, *20*, 97-119.

Classic Selections

Behn, R. D "Leadership for Cutback Management: The Use of Corporate Strategy." *Public Administration Review*, 1980, *40* (6), 613-620.
Boulding, K. "The Management of Decline." *Change*, 1975, *64*, 8-9.
Bowen, F. M. and Glenny, L. A. *Uncertainty in Public Higher Education:*

Responses to Stress at Ten California Colleges and Universities. Sacramento: California Postsecondary Education Committee, 1980.

Cyert, R. M. "The Management of Universities of Constant or Decreasing Size." *Public Administration Review*, 1978, *38* (4), 344–349.

Levine, C. H., ed. *Managing Fiscal Stress*. Chatham, N.J.: Chatham House, 1980.

Levine, C. H. "Organizational Decline and Cutback Management." *Public Administration Review*, 1978, *38* (4), 316–325.

Mortimer, K. P. and Tierney, M. L. *The Three R's of the Eighties: Reduction, Reallocation and Retrenchment*. AAHE/ERIC Higher Education Research Report No. 4. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1979.

Rubin, I. "Universities in Stress: Decision Making Under Conditions of Reduced Resources." *Social Science Quarterly*, 1977, *58* (2), 242–254.

Smart, C. and Vertinsky, I. "Designs for Crisis Decision Units." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 1977, *22* (4), 640–657.

Shaw, B. M., Sandelands, L. E., and Dutton, J. E. "Threat-Rigidity Effects in Organizational Behavior." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 1981, *26* (4), 501–524.

Whetten, D. A. "Organizational Responses to Scarcity: Exploring the Obstacles to Innovative Approaches to Retrenchment in Education." *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 1981, *17* (3), 80–97.

Program Evaluation and Techniques of Evaluation

Evaluation of institutional programs is a critical tactical element. Evaluation can be summative and/or formative in nature depending upon the role evaluation has in the planning process. Program evaluation can also be directed at the unit, institution, and state levels. All of these perspectives are represented in the following citations.

Critical Reading

Barak, R. J. "Program Planning, Development and Evaluation." *Key Resources on Higher Education Governance, Management and Leadership*. Edited by M. W. Peterson and L. A. Mets. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1987.

Barak, R. J. *Program Review in Higher Education: From Within and Without*. Boulder, CO: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, 1982.

Barak, R. J. "Seven Common Myths on Program Review." *Educational Record*, 1986, *67* (1), 52–54.

Conrad, C. F. and Wilson, R. F. *Academic Program Reviews: Institutional Approaches, Expectations, and Controversies*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 5. Washington, D.C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education, 1985.

Gilley, J. W., Fulmer, K. A., and Reithlingshoefer, S. J. *Searching for Aca-*

demic Excellence. New York: MacMillan/American Council for Education, 1986.
Steeples, D. *Institutional Revival: Case Histories*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1986.
Wilson, R. F., ed. *Designing Academic Program Reviews*. New Directions for Higher Education No. 37. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1982.

Recent Selections

Adelman, C. *Assessment in American Higher Education*. Washington, D.C.: Office of Education Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, 1986.
Barak, R. J. and Miller, R. I. "Rating Undergraduate Program Review at the State Level." *Education Record*, 1986, *67* (2-3), 42-46.
Wilson, R. F., ed. "Critical Issues in Program Evaluation." *Review of Higher Education*, Winter 1984, *1*, 143-157.

Classic Selections

Anderson, S. B., Ball, S., Murphy, R. T., and Associates. *Encyclopedia of Educational Evaluation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.
Anderson, S. B. and Ball, S. *The Profession and Practice of Program Evaluation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.
Arns, R. G. and Poland, W. "Changing the University Through Program Review." *Journal of Higher Education*, 1981, *51* (3), 268-284.
Barak, R. J. and Berdahl, R. O. *State-level Academic Program Review*. Denver: Education Commission of the States, 1978.
Craven, E., ed. *Academic Program Evaluation*. New Directions for Institutional Research No. 27. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.
Craven, E. "Evaluating Program Performance." In P. Jedamus, M. W. Peterson, & Associates, *Improving Academic Management*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980, 432-457.
Davis, C. K. and Dougherty, E. A. "Guidelines for Program Discontinuance." *Educational Record*, Winter 1979, *60* (1), 68-77.
Dressel, P. L. *Handbook of Academic Evaluation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976.
Feasley, C. E. *Program Evaluation*. AAHE/ERIC Higher Education Research Report No. 2. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1980.
Franchak, S. J. *Using Education Results: Guidelines and Practice for Using Vocational Evaluation Effectively*. Columbus, Ohio: National Center for Research in Vocational Education, 1981.
Miller, R. I. *The Assessment of College Performance*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1979.
Munitz, B. "Examining Administrative Performance." In P. Jedamus, M. W. Peterson, & Associates, *Improving Academic Management*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980, 478-494.

Patton, M. Q. *Utilization Focused Evaluation*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 1978.
Shirley, R. C. and Volkwein, J. F. "Establishing Academic Program Priorities." *Journal of Higher Education*, 1978, *49* (5), 472-488.
Warmbrod, C. and Persavich, J. J. *Post-Secondary Program Evaluation*. Columbus, Ohio: National Center for Research in Vocational Education, 1981.
Wildavsky, A. "The Self-Evaluating Organization." *Public Administration Review*, Sept/Oct 1972, *32* (5), 509-520.

Academic Planning

With the emergence of strategic planning, enrollment planning and management, and marketing in higher education, academic program planning has shifted in emphasis from program content to the needs of learners, the management of human and capital resources for program delivery, and the evaluation of program outcomes or "quality." The citations below represent a cross-section of these issues affecting academic program planning. Additional references relating to academic planning may be found under other headings in this bibliography.

Recent Selections

Tack, M. W., Rentz, A., and Russell, R. L. "Strategic Planning for Academic Programs: A Strategy for Institutional Survival." *Planning for Higher Education*, 1984, *12* (4), 8-14.

Classic Selections

Blackburn, R. T. "Faculty Career Development: Theory and Practice." *Faculty Vitality and Institutional Productivity*. Edited by S. Clark and D. Lewis. New York: Teachers College Press, 1985, 55-85.
Fuller, B. "A Framework for Academic Planning." *Journal of Higher Education*, 1976, *47* (1), 65-77.
Heydinger, R. B. "Planning Academic Programs." In P. Jedamus, M. W. Peterson, & Associates, *Improving Academic Management*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980, 304-326.
Jenny, H., Heim, P., and Hughes, G. *Another Challenge: Age 70 Retirement in Higher Education*. New York: TIAA-CREF, 1979.
Kells, H. R. "Academic Planning: An Analysis of Case Experiences in the Academic Setting." *Planning for Higher Education*, 1977, *6* (2), 2-9.
Patton, C. V. *Academia in Transition: Mid-Career Change or Early Retirement*. Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates, 1979.
Radner, R. and Kuh, C. *Preserving a Lost Generation: Policies to Assure a Steady Flow of Young Scholars Until the Year 2000*. Berkeley, CA: Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, 1978.
Zemsky, R., Porter, R. and Oedel, L. P. "Decentralized Planning: To Share Responsibility," *Educational Record*, 1978, *59* (3), 229-253.

Enrollment Planning and Management

The appearance of the term *enrollment management* merges the theory and practice of enrollment projection and forecasting, manpower supply and demand, marketing as applied to higher education, and the growing emphasis on recruiting and retention.

Critical Reading

Hossler, D. *Creating Effective Enrollment Management Systems*. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1987.

Litten, L. H., Sullivan, D., and Brodigan, D. L. *Applying Market Research in College Admissions*. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1983.

Zammuto, R. F. "Managing Declining Enrollments and Revenues." *Key Resources on Higher Education Governance, Management and Leadership*. Edited by M. W. Peterson and L. A. Mets. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1987.

Zemsky, R. and Oedel, P. *The Structure of College Choice*. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1983.

Recent Selections

Baldridge, J. V., Kemerer, F. R. and Green, K.C. *The Enrollment Crisis: Factors, Actors, and Impacts*. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1982.

Baldridge, J. V., Kemerer, F. R., and Green, K. C. *Strategies for Effective Enrollment Management*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 1982.

Hossler, D. *Enrollment Management: An Integrated Approach*. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1984.

Hossler, D., ed. *Managing College Enrollments*. New Directions for Higher Education No. 53. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1986.

Kotler, P. and Fox, K. *Strategic Marketing for Educational Institutions*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1985.

Classic Selections

Centra, J. A. *College Enrollment in the 1980's: Projections and Possibilities*. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1978.

Grabowski, S. M. *Marketing in Higher Education*. AAHE/ERIC Higher Education Research Report No. 5. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1981.

Ihlanfeldt, W. *Achieving Optimal Enrollments and Tuition Revenues*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.

Norris, D. M., Lasher, W. F. and Brandt, F. S. *Manpower Studies in Postsecondary Education*. AAHE/ERIC Higher Education Research Report

No. 10. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1977.
Kotler, P. *Marketing for Non-Profit Organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1975.
Wing, P. "Forecasting Enrollment and Student Demographic Conditions." In P. Jedamus, M. W. Peterson, & Associates, *Improving Academic Management*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980, 216-237.

Campus and Facilities Planning

In the literature, campus planning generally refers to the overall, integrative process of creating a "campus master plan," which deals with the relationships between individual buildings and the campus as a whole. Facilities planning focuses upon the individual building and the systems which it contains.

Critical Reading

Clipson, C. W. and Johnson, R. E. "Integrated Approaches to Facilities Planning and Assessment." *Planning for Higher Education*, 1987, *15* (3), 12-22.
Turner, P. V. *Campus: An American Planning Tradition*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1984.

Recent Selections

Wilson, L. S. "Planning for Excellence: The Capital Facilities Dilemma in the American Graduate School." *Planning for Higher Education*, 1987, *15* (1), 1-6.

Classic Selections

Bareither, H. and Schillinger, J. L. *University Space Planning*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1968.
Bullock, N., Dickens, P., and Steadman, P. *Theoretical Basis for University Planning*. Cambridge, England: Polyhedron Printers Ltd., 1968.
Danke, H. L., Jones, D. P., Mason, T. R., and Romney, L. *Higher Education Facilities Planning and Management Models*. Boulder, CO: Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education, 1971.
Dober, R. P. *Campus Planning*. New York: Reinhold Publishing, 1964.
Hewitt, C. "Campus Renewal in the 1980's: The New Voyage of the Beagle." *Planning for Higher Education*, 1982, *11* (1), 14-24.
Kaiser, H. D., ed. *Managing Facilities More Effectively*. New Directions for Higher Education No. 30. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.
Loomis, W. and Skeen, O. "Evaluating the Adequacy of Campus Physical Facilities." *Planning for Higher Education*, 1977, *6* (3).
Mayer, F. "The Implementable Plan." *Planning for Higher Education*, Summer 1980, *8* (4), 1-6.

Regnier, J. H. "Improving the Utilization of Capital Facilities." In P. Jedamus, M. W. Peterson, & Associates, *Improving Academic Management*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980, 392-405.
United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization. *Planning and Building Facilities for Higher Education*. New York: UNESCO Press/ Dowd Hutchison and Ross, 1975.

4.7 DECISION SUPPORT FOR PLANNING

One of the most highly developed bodies of literature is in the area of decision support for planning, which encompasses the use of information in planning, planning for technology, quantitative support of plans, and decision support systems. Our selection in this area covers a broad range of issues.

Critical Reading

David, G. B. and Holson, M. *Management Information Systems: Conceptual Foundations, Structure and Developments*. 2nd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1985.
Hiltz, S. R. and Turoff, M. *The Network Nation: Human Communication via Computer*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1978.
Hopkins, D. S. P. and Massy, W. F. *Planning Models for Colleges and Universities*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1981.
Keen, P. G. and Scott Morton, W. M. *Decision Support Systems: An Organizational Perspective*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1978.
Quarterman, J. F. and Hoskins, J. C. "Notable Computer Networks." *Communications of the ACM*, 1986, *29* (10), 932-971.
Sheehan, B. S. "Decision Support: Applying Information, Computers and Telecommunications." *Key Resources on Higher Education Governance, Management and Leadership*. Edited by M. W. Peterson and L. A. Mets. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1987.
Sprague, R. H. and Carlsen, E. D. *Building Effective Decision Support Systems*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1982.
Tetlow, W. L., ed. *Using Microcomputers for Planning and Management Support*. New Directions for Institutional Research No. 44. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1984.

Recent Selections

Benjamin, R. I., Rockart, J. F., Scott Morton, M.S., and Wyman, J. "Information Technology: A Strategic Opportunity," *Sloan Management Review*, Spring 1984, *25* (3), 3-10.
Camillos, John C. and Lederer, A. L. "Corporate Strategy and the Design of Computerized Information Systems." *Sloan Management Review*, Spring 1985, *27* (3), 35-42.
Jones, D. P. *Data and Information for Executive Decisions in Higher Edu-*

cation. Boulder: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, 1982.
Lucas, H. C. "A Corporate Strategy for the Control of Information Processing." *Sloan Management Review*, Spring 1982, 25-36.
McFarland, F. W., McKenney, J. L. and Pyburn, P. "The Information Archipelago – Plotting a Course." *Harvard Business Review*, 1983, *61* (1), 145-146.
McKenny, J. L. and McFarland, F. W. "The Information Archipelago – Maps and Bridges." *Harvard Business Review*, 1982, *60* (5), 109-119.
Rockart, J. F. "The Changing Role of the Information Systems Executive: A Critical Success Factors Perspective." *Sloan Management Review*, Fall 1982, *24* (1), 3-13.
Rockart, J. F., and Crescenzi, A. D. "Engaging Top Management in Information Technology." *Sloan Management Review*, Summer 1984, *25* (4), 3-16.
Rohrbaugh, J. and McCartt, T. eds. *Applying Decision Support Systems in Higher Education*. New Directions for Institutional Research No. 49. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1986.
Sheehan, B. S., ed. *Information Technology: Innovations and Applications*. New Directions for Institutional Research No. 35. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1982.
Sullivan, C. H. "Systems Planning in the Information Age." *Sloan Management Review*, Winter 1985, *27* (2), 3-12.

Classic Selections

Adams, C. R., et al. "Decision Making and Information Systems in Colleges." *Journal of Higher Education*, 1976, *57* (1), 33-49.
Ascher, W. "The Forecasting Potential of Complex Models." *Policy Sciences*, 1981, *13* (3), 247-267.
Buchanan, J. R. and Linowes, R. C. "Understanding Distributed Data Processing." *Harvard Business Review*, 1980, *58* (4), 143-153.
Buchanan, J. R. and Linowes, R. C. "Making Distributed Data Processing Work." *Harvard Business Review*, 1980, *58* (5), 143-161.
Carlson, E. D. "An Approach for Designing Decision Support Systems." *Data Base*, Winter 1980 (entire issue).
Feldman, M. S. and March, J. G. "Information in Organizations as Signal and Symbol." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 1981, *26* (1), 171-186.
Hackman, J. D. and Libby, P. A. "Toward More Effective Strategic Planning: Annotated Readings About Planning, Human Information Processing and Decision Support Systems." *Planning for Higher Education*, 1981, *9* (4), 40-46.
Hopkins, D. S. P. and Schroeder, R. G., eds. *Applying Analytic Methods to Planning and Management*. New Directions for Institutional Research No. 13. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.
Kantrow, A. M. "The Strategy Technology Connection." *Harvard Business Review*, 1980, *58* (4), 6-21.
Lawrence, G. B. and Service, A., eds. *Quantitative Approaches to Higher*

Education Management. AAHE/ERIC Higher Education Research Report No. 4. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1977.

Massy, W. F. "Reflections on the Application of a Decision Science Model to Higher Education." *Decision Sciences*, 1978, *9* (2), 362-369.

Sheehan, B. S. "Developing Effective Information Systems." In P. Jedamus, M. W. Peterson, & Associates, *Improving Academic Management*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980, 510-538.

Ungson, G. R., Braunstein, D., and Hall, P. P. "Managerial Information Processing: A Research Review." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, March 1981.

Updegrove, D., ed. "Special Issue on Financial Planning Models: Benefits, Directions, Alternatives." *EDUCOM Bulletin*, Fall 1982.

4.8 SOURCES OF INFORMATION AND PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Specialized Associations of Interest

Planners seem compelled to group together to discuss their field. The following address list of professional associations dealing with planning may be of assistance to the new planner seeking information on membership, services, and publications.

1. Society for College and University Planning
   2026M School of Education Building
   The University of Michigan
   Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109-1259
2. Association for Institutional Research
   314 Stone Building
   Florida State University
   Tallahassee, Florida 32306
3. Planning Forum
   5500 College Corner Pike
   PO Box 70
   Oxford, Ohio 45056
4. Issues Management Association
   105A Old Long Ridge Road
   Stamford, Connecticut 06903
5. World Future Society
   4916 St. Elmo Avenue
   Bethesda, Maryland 20814-5089
6. American Association for Higher Education
   One Dupont Circle, Suite 600
   Washington, D. C. 20036
7. American Institute of Architects
   1735 New York Avenue, N.W.
   Washington, D. C. 20006
8. Council of Educational Facilities Planners-International
   1060 Carmack Road, Suite 160
   Columbus, Ohio 43210-1002

Publications

SCUP publishes a newsletter and a journal, *Planning for Higher Education*, while the Association for Institutional Research (AIR) publishes a newsletter and a journal, *Research in Higher Education*. Jossey-Bass sponsors a series of more comprehensive monographs on issues pertaining to higher education planning entitled *New Directions in Institutional Research*. The American Association for Higher Education (AAHE) also concerns itself with planning along with other areas of interest and publishes a series of research reports annually, some of which deal with planning issues. The Association for the Study of Higher Education (ASHE) also encourages research and a publication series that can have planning-related material. An interesting international journal is *The International Journal of Institutional Management in Higher Education*.

Being a cross- and interdisciplinary endeavor, planning articles can appear in a wide variety of publications. Other journals which regularly provide articles on planning and policy analysis include the following:

- *Change*
- *Harvard Business Review*
- *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*
- *Long Range Planning*
- *Academy of Management Review*
- *Management Science*
- *Policy Sciences Journal*
- *Administrative Science Quarterly*
- *Public Administration Review*
- *The Political Science Quarterly*
- *Sloan Management Review*
- *NACUBO Professional File*

5.0 KEEP MOVING FORWARD AND LOOKING BACK

As your planning process moves forward and begins to be judged on its performance and not its promise, you will find that the unpleasant residue which you must get rid of will not be that of your predecessor – but your own! Do not be overly concerned; all planning activities produce some negative outcomes, pick up detractors along the way – in addition to those with which they began – and arouse opposition. Your challenge is to be certain that there are also positive elements to counterbalance the negative and to convince your leadership that planning is helping them to deal with problems which would have festered and emerged at a later point in a more onerous form. If you don't convince your leadership, then you may suffer the same fate, figuratively speaking, as the late messenger of bad tidings.

By moving forward and looking back, you can assess where you went awry and take corrective action. Planning processes, structures, and analytic support must be tuned and changed to adjust for clearer vision and for new challenges. No planning activity ever truly ends – what is past is prologue. The challenge is to focus your planning activities on emerging issues, challenges, and opportunities. Learning from past planning activities and facing new challenges is the hallmark of successful planning. In a sense this is what Cohen and March refer to as "planning in the future perfect tense": using your experience with the past to confront new challenges and to posit what the future must be to deal with them. Planning-oriented behavior is not without its problems, but once you have tasted the challenge of helping your institution confront tomorrow's challenges today, you will not be content with your old challenges. Good luck – and good planning!

The Society for College and University Planning
2026M School of Education Building
The University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109-1259
U.S.A.